
5E

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Initial Accreditation and Program Review

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents proposals submitted by local education agencies and institutions of higher education for initial institutional accreditation and for subject matter program approval. The agenda item provides an overview of the process for reviewing proposals, analysis of the program proposals, costs associated with the reviews, and options for Commission action.

Recommended Action: That the Commission act upon initial institutional accreditation for the Santa Barbara County Education Office and that the Commission act upon the Single Subject Matter Preparation Program in English from California State University, Long Beach.

Presenter: Lawrence Birch, Administrator, Jim Alford, Consultant, and Helen Hawley, Consultant, Professional Services Division.

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Assess and monitor the efficacy of the Accreditation System, Examination System, and State and Federal Funded Programs.

Initial Accreditation and Program Review

Introduction

This agenda item presents proposals submitted by local education agencies and institutions of higher education for initial institutional accreditation, and single subject matter preparation program approval. The agenda item provides an overview of the process for reviewing proposals, analysis of the program proposals, costs associated with the reviews, and options for Commission action.

California law requires the Commission to adopt a framework and general standards for the accreditation of preparation programs and for the evaluation of institutions and programs that prepare educators. Education Code §44259 also charges the Commission with the responsibility for ensuring that subject matter standards and examinations are aligned with the state content and performance standards for pupils. Education Code §44311 requires the Commission to evaluate any subject matter program offered by an accredited institution. In carrying out these responsibilities, the Commission grants initial accreditation to institutions and local education agencies seeking to offer preparation programs and also approves subject matter programs. The Commission's Committee on Accreditation is responsible for making decisions about the ongoing accreditation of program sponsors and approves the professional preparation programs that are offered by each accredited entity.

I. Initial Institutional Accreditation – Background

Prior to 1995, institutions not previously approved to offer programs of professional preparation would submit a program proposal responding to the preconditions and standards of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. If the institution was accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) or another regional accrediting body and if the response to the preconditions and standards was judged to be satisfactory, the Commission voted to give approval to the institution to begin offering one or more programs.

With the adoption of the *Accreditation Framework* in 1995, the Commission made a distinction was between “initial accreditation of institutions” and “initial accreditation of programs,” as described below.

Policies for Initial Accreditation of Institutions

Under the authority of the Education Code, the Commission has the authority to determine the eligibility of institutions to offer preparation programs and to recommend issuance of credentials to candidates completing programs of preparation. This authority also applies to other program

sponsors such as school districts, who were made eligible to sponsor professional educator preparation programs through subsequent legislation.

Education Code Section 44227 (a) – The Commission may approve any institution of higher education whose teacher education program meets the standards prescribed by the Commission, to recommend to the Commission the issuance of credentials to persons who have successfully completed those programs.

Education Code Section 44372 – The powers and duties of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing regarding the accreditation system shall include the following:

- (c) Rule on the eligibility of an applicant for accreditation when the applying institution has not previously prepared educators for state certification in California, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 44227.

Accreditation Framework Section 4 A 1 - Initial Accreditation of Institutions. A post-secondary education institution that has not previously been declared eligible to offer credential preparation programs must submit an application to the Commission for initial professional accreditation. Institutional accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) or another regional accrediting body is required for initial professional accreditation by the Commission. The Commission may establish additional procedures and criteria for the initial professional accreditation of institutions to prepare and recommend candidates for state credentials in education.

Under the above provisions, the only specific criterion for initial accreditation is regional accreditation. However, the Commission is given authority by the *Accreditation Framework* to establish additional procedures and criteria. In October 1998, the Commission adopted procedures and additional requirements for initial accreditation.

Adopted Procedures for Initial Institutional Accreditation

The following procedures, adopted by the Commission, apply to institutions and other program sponsors, such as school districts, who have not previously prepared educators for state certification in California:

1. The institution (program sponsor) prepares a complete program proposal that responds to all preconditions, Common Standards and appropriate Program Standards. The proposal is considered to be the application for accreditation.
2. Initial Accreditation is a two-stage process:
 - a. The proposal is reviewed for compliance with the appropriate preconditions (regional accreditation [or governing board approval], identification of position responsible for oversight, non-discrimination procedures, completion of a needs assessment, involvement of practitioners in the design of the program, agreement to provide information to the Commission, etc.) and brought before the Commission

for initial institutional accreditation action. If the proposal meets the Commission's requirements, the institution (program sponsor) will be recommended for initial accreditation.

- b. If the Commission acts favorably on the proposal, it will be forwarded to the Committee on Accreditation for further action. The program sponsor's responses to the credential program standards for each program the institution (sponsor) wishes to offer are reviewed by Commission staff or panels of expert advisors to determine the sufficiency of the responses. Once it is determined that the program proposal meets the Commission's program standards, the program sponsor is recommended to the Committee on Accreditation for initial program accreditation.
3. Once granted initial accreditation, the institution (program sponsor) will then come under the continuing accreditation procedures and will participate in the regular cycle for on-site reviews.

Fiscal Considerations of Initial Institutional Accreditation Review Process

The costs of reviewing a prospective program sponsor for Initial Institutional Accreditation are relatively minor for the Commission. Before a proposal is submitted for review, there is usually consultation with one or more Commission staff members. Typically, the consultation would be one to two hours in length. Once the proposal is submitted, staff review is conducted to see if it is complete, if responses to the required preconditions and standards are satisfactory, and if appropriate supporting evidence is included. If the response is incomplete, the prospective sponsor is notified and given the opportunity to submit additional information. Depending on the thoroughness of the submission, the review could take as little as two to three hours of staff time. However, if the response to the preconditions is deficient, the time necessary to complete the review could increase to double the time. If the proposal meets the Commission's requirements, a Commission agenda item will be prepared and the program sponsor will be considered for initial institutional accreditation. The estimated time for the preparation of the agenda item is two to three hours of staff time. The total amount of time required for an initial institutional action would be, at a minimum, of five to eight hours of staff time.

The time necessary for the prospective program sponsor to prepare the proposal would be considerably longer, responding to all required preconditions and standards and supplying supporting evidence. Further, once the program sponsor is granted initial institutional accreditation, the program proposal is forwarded for program review by staff or a review panel. That process is described later in this agenda report.

An ongoing cost to the Commission, once a program sponsor has been given initial institutional accreditation, is the inclusion in the ongoing continuing accreditation system. At the present time, this would mean regular updating of program standards and participation in the accreditation site visit process. For every new program sponsor granted initial institutional accreditation, the Commission's accountability responsibilities are increased.

Request for Initial Institutional Accreditation from the Santa Barbara County Education Office

The Santa Barbara County Education Office (SBCEO) is a local education agency. Its Instructional Services Department indicates that its goal is “Developing leaders for the new educational paradigm of bringing all students to proficiency on state standards through the implementation of standards-based, data-driven learning communities, combined with the realization of the tenets of equity and social justice.” SBCEO currently operates state-approved teacher induction and AB 75 principal training programs and serves more than 63,000 students and 23 school districts in the areas of special education, juvenile court schools, child development, and an array of other educational programs.

Senate Bill 1655, Scott (Chapter 225, Statutes of 2002) created options for alternative administrator preparation programs and established an examination-based route for obtaining administrative services credentials. When the Commission adopted new Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential in May 2003, an alternate route was created that allowed school districts to submit a standards-based program for the initial level of administrator certification. The Santa Barbara County Education Office has had some prior experience in preparing school leaders through its implementation of an AB 75 Principal Training Program, which provides professional development to beginning administrators. Due to a perceived local need for additional school leaders and an interest in preparing administrators who are prepared for the challenges currently facing public schools, SBCEO explored the option of developing its own preliminary administrative services credential program. In researching various options and requirements for program development, SBCEO elected to form a collaborative with the Fielding Graduate Institute, a WASC-accredited graduate institution, to develop a program proposal responding to Commission standards for such programs. The proposal resulting from this collaboration was submitted to the Commission for approval, accompanied by a response to the Commission’s Common Standards for educator preparation programs and applicable Commission preconditions. Commission staff reviewed the preconditions to verify program compliance, and reviewed the program proposal and response to the Common Standards for completeness. Since field reviewers are assigned the responsibility for reviewing program proposals and Common Standards responses against Commission standards for sufficient quality, staff’s review of those items is only for completeness, i.e., a full response to each of the applicable standards.

Review of Institutional Proposal

The Santa Barbara County Education Office has submitted a complete response to the Commission's Preconditions, Common Standards, and Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Programs (Appendix A). The responses to the preconditions and standards were reviewed by Commission staff and were determined to be appropriate (Appendix B). A Commission action to grant initial accreditation will allow the completion of the review of the program proposal. The results of the review of responses to the Common Standards and Program Standards will be forwarded to the Committee on Accreditation for further consideration.

II. Initial Program Review and Approval – Background

Program sponsors who have already received initial institutional accreditation are eligible to submit new programs of preparation for review and approval. Under the *Accreditation Framework* in 1995, The Committee on Accreditation was given initial program accreditation responsibilities for the professional preparation programs included in the ongoing accreditation site visit process. All other types of program approval remained with the Commission. Thus, the results of the program review of a professional preparation program are submitted to the Committee on Accreditation for program accreditation according to the *Accreditation Framework* (Section 2 A 2). Other programs, including subject matter preparation programs are submitted to the Commission for approval. In either case, the review process is the same. The difference is in the body making the final decision to approve the program.

Policies for Program Review

Under the authority of the Education Code, the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation both have responsibilities related to the review of programs of preparation.

Education Code Section 44311 – The Commission shall evaluate any subject matter program offered by an accredited institution in satisfaction of paragraph (5) of subdivision (b) or Section 44259. The evaluation shall be based on standards of program quality and effectiveness, which shall be consistent with the assessments and examinations of subject matter knowledge and competence adopted by the Commission.

Education Code Section 44259 (b) (5) – (Requirements for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credential) Completion of a subject matter program that has been approved by the commission on the basis of standards of program quality and effectiveness pursuant to Article 6 (commencing with Section 44310) or passage of a subject matter examination pursuant to Article 5 (commencing with Section 44280). The Commission shall ensure that subject matter standards and examinations are aligned with the state content and performance standards for pupils adopted pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 60605

Education Code Section 44373(c) – The committee (Committee on Accreditation) shall do, but not be limited to doing all of the following:

- (2) Make decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs of educator preparation in accordance with procedures adopted by the committee.

Initial Program Review Procedures

Following are the general procedures for the review of new programs:

1. Technical Assistance – After the Commission adopts a set of new program standards, Commission staff members provide technical assistance to sponsors wishing to submit

responses to the new standards. The technical assistance may take several forms. Staff members may arrange meetings of prospective sponsors to discuss the standards and how to respond to them. Staff members respond to questions from sponsors in e-mails and telephone calls. Occasionally, staff members will provide an informal review of one or more written responses to standards. Finally, technical assistance materials are provided on the Commission's website.

2. **Preconditions Review** – After the program proposal is received, Commission staff members review the sponsor's response to the preconditions. The preconditions are based on state laws and Commission policies and do not involve issues of program quality but do address minimum unit and content area requirements. Once the staff determines that the proposed program complies with the requirements of state laws and Commission policies, the program is given a further review of the standards by the staff or a review panel. If the program does not comply with the preconditions, the proposal is returned to the sponsor with specific information about the lack of compliance. The sponsor may resubmit the proposal with the inclusion of the requested information.
3. **Program Review** – In addition to the preconditions review, the program sponsor's responses to the credential program standards for the program submitted are reviewed. Unlike the preconditions, the standards address issues of program quality and effectiveness. Each response to the standards is reviewed by Commission staff and/or external volunteer K-12 or postsecondary educators expert in the field of preparation to determine the sufficiency of the responses. Reviewers are trained in the standards and the review process and then assigned proposals to review. Once the reviewers determine that the program proposal meets the Commission's program standards, the program is recommended to the Committee on Accreditation for initial program accreditation or the Commission for program approval. If the program does not meet the standards, the proposal is returned to the sponsor with an explanation of the findings. The sponsor may resubmit the proposal with the inclusion of the requested information.
4. Once granted initial program accreditation, the institution (program sponsor) will then come under the Commission's continuing accreditation procedures and will participate in the regular cycle for on-site reviews, as appropriate.

Fiscal Considerations of Program Review Process

The costs of reviewing a prospective program for Initial Program Approval will vary. Before a proposal is submitted for review, there may be consultation with one or more Commission staff members. Typically, the consultation might be one to two hours in length. Once the proposal is submitted, staff review is conducted to see if it is complete, if responses to the required preconditions and standards are satisfactory, and if appropriate supporting evidence is included. If the response is incomplete, the prospective sponsor is notified and given the opportunity to submit additional information. Depending on the thoroughness of the submission, the preconditions review could take as little as one hour of staff time. The full review of a program proposal could take from four to eight hours to review the responses to the standards per

reviewer. Again, if the response to the preconditions or standards is deficient, the time necessary to complete the review could increase. Each review requires at least two reviewers to reach consensus about the response of the program sponsor. Reviewers communicate by e-mail or telephone about the results of their individual reviews and come to agreement about the specific review. If reviewers cannot agree upon the program report, another reviewer and/or staff interact with the original reviewers to come to agreement about the response.

Over the past fifteen years, varied methods have been used for program reviews. For many years, the Commission brought groups of volunteer program reviewers together (paying only their transportation, lodging and meal costs) and conducted two-day meetings of reviewers, providing them with training and protected time to review the proposals and discuss the results with colleagues. These review sessions resulted in an expedient method of reviewing programs because many reviews could be completed in the two day review meeting. In more recent times, because of fiscal constraints, the Commission has not been able to bring reviewers together. Instead, after an initial training session, the reviewers are assigned a document to review at home and all communication takes place by e-mail or telephone. Although less costly, the time necessary for an individual reader complete the review of a proposal in “non-protected” time more typically takes two to three months for the review of a single program to be completed.

Request for Initial Program Approval from California State University, Long Beach

The Single Subject Program in English at California State University Long Beach promotes a holistic vision of the language arts and their interconnections (Appendix C). The required core studies of the program consist of 39 units that cover the four subject matter domains for teacher preparation in English. It is a meaning-centered curriculum providing students with a survey of English and American Literature, the study of multicultural and adolescent literature, Shakespeare, rhetoric and composition, and literary theory structured with the goal of developing lifelong readers and writers. Students are exposed to recent theories of literacy, linguistics and language acquisition, as well as current research in the teaching of writing as a process. They are encouraged to utilize writing as a heuristic and a means of self-expression. Throughout their coursework, students demonstrate and evaluate oral performance in a variety of forms, thus improving their speaking and listening skills on an ongoing basis.

The outcomes of the English Single Subject Program have been carefully aligned with the California frameworks and have been adopted by the faculty. Graduates will be expected to read sophisticated texts and demonstrate the ability to attend to patterns and stylistic features; interpret and understand written works within cultural, social, and historical contexts; recognize a continuing dialogue among authors across history; derive knowledge and pleasure from reading literature; and analyze and write at high levels. They will also be able to analyze varied written texts; exercise skills to identify central themes or arguments; evaluate arguments on evidence; recognize and appreciate poetic, narrative and dramatic form to structure imagery and symbolism; and to place texts in historical and cultural contexts, recognizing how literature reflects and has an impact on human behavior. Students will also be able to follow conventions of academic writing; demonstrate the skills to organize discussions and essays logically; use outline or other appropriate tools; articulate a substantive and demonstrable thesis; elaborate in

coherent, fully developed paragraphs; support assertions with specific details; use reason and emotion appropriate to the effect desired; maintain stylistic control over diction, grammar, syntax and mechanics; use styles and diction suitable to specific audiences; and improve writing through revision. Speaking and listening skills are honed and utilized in every course that includes oral presentation, which is an expectation of every course in the program. Further, students will be able analyze language structures, understand the process of language acquisition and development, know and use strategies of textual analysis for constructing meaning, and have a metacognitive understanding of reading and writing as a process.

In addition to the 39-unit program core, prospective teachers choose 12 units from among nine possible emphases in the following content areas: Black Studies, Comparative Literature, Creative Writing, Journalism, Language and Linguistics, Literacy and Composition, Literature, Speech Communication, and Theater. Faculty from the relevant departments select courses for the various emphases that they believe will be most useful to prospective teachers. The program course work develops three invaluable skills for an English teacher—analytical reading, effective writing, and critical thinking about human interaction, gained through study of the best writing in the English language. Class sizes are relatively small and one-on-one conferencing with students is widely practiced. Integrating career goals and knowledge of the discipline, students also complete 100 fieldwork hours in the program.

Review of Institutional Proposal

California State University, Long Beach has submitted a complete response to the Commission's Preconditions and Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Single Subject Matter Preparation Programs in English (Appendix D). The responses to the preconditions were reviewed by Commission staff and are judged to be met (Appendix E). The responses to the standards were reviewed by a subject matter review panel and are judged to be met. Based on the satisfactory review of responses to Preconditions and Standards, it is appropriate to bring the Single Subject English program for California State University, Long Beach to the Commission for consideration.

III. Options, Costs and Considerations

Staff will have a copy of both the Santa Barbara County Education Office proposal and the California State University, Long Beach proposal available for review when this item is presented to the Commission.

Costs

Costs associated with reviewing these proposals are included in the Commission's operating budget and are estimated to be as follows:

Santa Barbara County Office of Education: Initial consultation – one hour of staff time; staff review of the preconditions – two hours of staff time, and preparation of the Commission agenda item – two hours of staff time. Total staff time – five hours.

California State University, Long Beach Single Subject English Program: Initial consultation and follow up consultation – two hours of staff time; staff review of preconditions – one hour of staff time; review of responses to standards – eight hours each for two volunteer readers; and preparation of the Commission agenda item, two hours of staff time. Total staff time – five hours and total volunteer reviewer time – sixteen hours.

In addition, ongoing support of the existing program review process includes the annual costs for maintaining the software of \$14,000, plus the costs of mailing documents (both staff preparation and postage) and tracking documents in the review process, notifying program sponsors of Commission approvals, and maintaining public lists of existing programs on the Commission website.

Options and Considerations:

Initial Institutional Accreditation

The Commission has the option to grant or deny initial institutional accreditation to the Santa Barbara County Education Office. Based on the satisfactory review of responses to Preconditions and Standards, Santa Barbara County Education Office meets the requirements for initial institutional accreditation establishing eligibility to submit a credential program for review.

Granting Initial Institutional Accreditation to the Santa Barbara County Education Office will enable this local education agency to complete the program review process for offering Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program. The results of the review of the Common Standards and Program Standards will be forwarded to the Committee on Accreditation for further consideration.

Initial Program Approval

The Commission has the option to grant or deny initial approval of the Single Subject Matter English program for California State University, Long Beach. Based on the satisfactory review of responses to Preconditions and Standards, the Single Subject Matter English program for California State University, Long Beach meets the requirements for approval.

Granting initial program approval to California State University, Long Beach will enable this institution to begin offering a single subject matter program in English this fall.

Staff Direction

Commission staff is seeking directions from the Commission regarding the initial accreditation of the Santa Barbara County Office of Education and approval of the California State University, Long Beach Single Subject Matter Program in English.

Appendix A

Excerpts from

Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credentials

**Handbook for Teacher Educators and
Accreditation Team Members**

Common Standards

General Preconditions

**Specific Preconditions for
Preliminary Administrative Credential Programs**

**Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Preliminary
Administrative Services Credential Programs**

January 2004

Common Standards

Standard 1

Education Leadership

The program sponsor (faculty, dean/director and program administration) articulates and supports a vision for the preparation of professional educators. All professional preparation programs are organized, governed, and coordinated with the active involvement of credential program faculty. Program leadership fosters cohesiveness in management; delegates responsibility and authority appropriately; resolves each professional preparation program's administrative needs as promptly as feasible; and represents the interests of each program in the institution, the education profession, and the school community.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist program sponsors in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- How clear is the leadership's vision for the preparation of educators? How well does this vision shape the design and delivery of each credential program? What evidence is there that the leadership of the program sponsor supports the goals and purposes of each program?
- How well does the leadership of the program develop a unified sense of teamwork among the administrators of sub-units, including credential programs?
- How clear are the lines of authority and responsibility for the management of each credential program? In what manner are program coordinators involved in appropriate decision-making bodies within the program leadership?
- How prompt is the leadership of the program in addressing and resolving problems in credential programs that are amenable to administrative solutions?
- How frequently and openly does the program leadership confer with the faculties who teach credential candidates and supervise their field experiences?
- To what extent is program leadership seen as an advocate for the credential programs, the education profession as a whole, and the local school community?

Common Standards Issues to be Addressed

Internship Programs

For an internship program: Each participating school district works with the program sponsor to give appropriate attention to the effective operation of the program. Because interns function as employees of the school district, it is important that the school district ensure that the program is operating in a manner to further the educational goals of the district. The employing school district supports the goals and purposes of the program and assures the college or university that the appropriate support for the intern is available in the district.

Standard 2

Resources

Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for the effective operation of each credential preparation program, to enable it to be effective in coordination, admission, advising, curriculum, instruction, and field experiences. Library and media resources, computer facilities, and support personnel, among others, are adequate.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist program sponsors in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- How adequate are personnel resources (including sufficient numbers of full and part-time positions for instructional faculty, field supervisors and support personnel) to staff each credential program and maintain its effectiveness?
- How well does the program sponsor provide a critical mass of faculty resources to provide breadth and depth of expertise to support an effective program of instruction and supervised field experience in each credential area? Do credential candidates have sufficient opportunity for contact with faculty members?
- To what extent do faculty, staff, and candidates have access to appropriate buildings, classrooms, offices, study areas, furniture, equipment, library services, computers, media, and instructional materials? Are these resources sufficient and adequate?
- To what extent do faculty, staff, and candidates have equitable and appropriate access to computer-based technology, information and network resources for teaching and learning?
- To what extent do faculty, staff, and candidates have adequate technical support services for maintenance and training to support instructional goals?

Common Standards Issues to be Addressed

Internship Programs

For an internship program: Each participating school district works with the program sponsor to provide sufficient resources to fulfill the needs of the program. Because interns function as employees of the school district, it is important that the school district provide sufficient resources, in addition to intern salaries, to assure the success of the program. The employing school district provides access to the resources to allow the intern to perform successfully in his or her position.

Standard 3

Faculty

Qualified persons are hired and assigned to teach all courses and supervise all field experiences in each credential preparation program. Faculty reflect and are knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity. The program sponsor provides support for faculty development, and recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching. The program sponsor regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, and retains in credential programs only those individuals who are consistently effective.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist program sponsors in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- How effectively does the program sponsor ensure that each credential program course and field experience is assigned to a faculty member who has an appropriate background of advanced study and professional experience that are directly related to his/her assignment(s) in the program?
- How does the program sponsor develop and utilize recruitment policies and goals to ensure the equitable hiring of faculty in credential preparation programs?
- How does the program sponsor ensure that all faculty members and field supervisors have current knowledge of schools and classrooms that reflect the cultural diversity of society?
- How well does the program sponsor follow equitable procedures for the identification of effective and ineffective course instructors and field supervisors?
- What procedures are in place to remove ineffective course instructors and field supervisors from their assignments in credential preparation programs? How consistently are the procedures applied?
- How does the program sponsor recognize excellence as a teacher, supervisor, and/or advisor in appointing, promoting and recognizing faculty members?
- How does the program sponsor ensure that all faculty members (full time and part time) have access to adequate resources for their professional development, including resources to support research, curriculum study and program development?

Standard 4

Evaluation

The program sponsor regularly involves program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses and field experiences, which leads to substantive improvements in each credential preparation program, as needed. Meaningful opportunities are provided for professional practitioners and diverse community members to become involved in program design, development and evaluation activities.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist program sponsors in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- To what extent is the evaluation system based upon criteria that are related to the design, rationale, goals and objectives of each program, and to the competence and performance criteria that are used to assess candidates in the programs?
- How does the program sponsor collect information about each program's strengths, weaknesses and needed improvements from all participants in the program, including course instructors, university and district supervisors, the employers of recent graduates, and each cohort of candidates during their enrollment and following their program completion? How comprehensively and frequently is information compiled?
- In what manner is evaluation information used to make qualitative decisions about credential preparation programs?
- As improvements in programs are considered, to what degree are they based on the results of program evaluation, the implications of new knowledge about teaching and schooling as it relates to each credential area, and the identified needs of schools and districts in the local service region?
- In what ways are meaningful and substantive opportunities provided for professional practitioners in multiple credential areas and persons who represent the diversity of the community to be involved in program evaluation and development activities?

Common Standards Issues to be Addressed

Internship Programs

For an internship program: The system of program evaluation and development includes representatives of the participating district(s), and representatives of persons who hold the affected credential from the participating district(s). Because interns perform the duties of fully certificated holders of the credential, it is important that representatives of these certificated employees, along with district representatives, participate fully in the development and evaluation of the internship program. The ongoing evaluation and development system includes substantive involvement from the program sponsor, participating school districts, and

representatives (the certificated exclusive representatives, if applicable) of holders of the affected credential.

Standard 5

Admission

In each professional preparation program, candidates are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures (including all Commission-adopted admission requirements) that utilize multiple measures. The admission of students from a diverse population is encouraged. The program sponsor determines that candidates meet high academic standards, as evidenced by appropriate measures of academic achievement, and demonstrate strong potential for professional success in schools, as evidenced by appropriate measures of personal characteristics and prior experience.

Commission-Adopted Credential Program Admission Requirements

All Internship Programs - Each internship candidate has had prior experiences and personal qualifications to enable candidates to perform at the level of responsibility required of an intern. Because interns perform the duties of fully certificated holders of the credential prior to the completion of a preparation program, it is important that they have had prior experiences which would adequately prepare them for the actual responsibilities of the position. When applicant's qualifications are evaluated, the program's admission criteria shall consider relevant experience and background to account for the increased responsibilities of interns.

General Advanced Credential Program Admission Requirements - As a group, candidates admitted into the program each year have attained a level of academic qualifications, using one or more indicators, equivalent to or higher than candidates admitted to other post-baccalaureate programs offered by the program sponsor. Each individual has personal qualities and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional success and effectiveness in the specialist or service area.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Programs - As a group, candidates admitted into the program each year have attained a level of academic qualifications, using one or more indicators, equivalent to or higher than candidates admitted to other post-baccalaureate programs offered by the program sponsor. Each individual has a record of professional accomplishment demonstrating leadership potential, and exhibits consistent adherence to moral and ethical standards of behavior.

Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential Programs – Candidates are admitted into the program in a timely way, once it has been determined that they have successfully completed requirements for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and are employed in an administrative position by a local education agency.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist program sponsors in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- To what extent are the admission criteria and procedures clearly described and available to prospective candidates for credentials?
- What are the multiple measures used by the program sponsor to define the academic achievement and professional potential of credential candidates?
- For the basic teaching credential programs, does the program sponsor define an appropriate comparison group? Does each admitted candidate have an undergraduate GPA that is above the median GPA for the comparison group?
- For advanced credential programs, does each admitted candidate meet the program sponsor's standards for graduate study?
- How does the program sponsor determine and evaluate each applicant's personal qualities and preprofessional qualifications, (including entry level computer skills) for example, personal interviews with candidates, written evaluation of candidates' prior experiences with children and youth, and prior leadership activities?
- What alternative criteria and procedures are used to encourage admission of candidates from underrepresented groups?
- To what extent do the program sponsor's recruitment and admissions policies and practices reflect a commitment to achieve a balanced representation of the population by gender, race, ethnicity and disability and to encourage admission of candidates from the program sponsor's service area?
- How do the admissions criteria consider the candidates' sensitivity to (and interest in) the needs of children and youth, with special consideration for sensitivity to those from diverse ethnic, cultural and socio-economic backgrounds?

Academic qualifications alone are not sufficient factors for program admission, because of the uniquely human character of the education profession. Each candidate for an administrative services credential must also bring appropriate personal characteristics and a record of professional accomplishments, so the program can build on human qualities and demonstrated abilities that are essential for effective service as an administrator. Before admitting candidates into the program, a program sponsor's representatives determine that each individual has a record of professional accomplishment demonstrating leadership potential, and exhibits consistent adherence to moral and ethical standards of behavior. The program's admission criteria require the candidate to have prior experiences in which suitability for administrative responsibilities is demonstrated in such areas as parent and community involvement, relationships with professional colleagues and demonstrated leadership activities.

Professional Level

Candidates are admitted into the program in a timely way, once it has been determined that they have successfully completed academic programs for the Preliminary Administrative services credential that they have been approved by the Committee on Accreditation, or have completed the equivalent at an accredited out-of-state institution, and are employed by a local education agency in an administrative position. The professional administrative services credential program is designed as an induction program for a newly hired administrator. This new administrator has already successfully completed requirements for the preliminary credential, has

competed for a position, and has been hired as an administrator. Timely admission to the program will allow for induction planning to begin early in the candidate's initial administrative experience.

Standard 6

Advice and Assistance

Qualified members of the program sponsor's staff are assigned and available to advise candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, as the need arises, and to assist in their professional placement. Adequate information is readily available to guide each candidate's attainment of all program and credential requirements. The program sponsor assists candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist program sponsors in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- How does the program sponsor ensure that student services, including academic advisement, professional assessment, personal counseling and career placement services are provided by qualified individuals who are assigned those responsibilities?
- Are student services provided equitably and made available when the candidates need them?
- In what manner does the program sponsor provide (a) advice regarding the realities and opportunities for entry into different areas of professional service and (b) assistance for candidates in the pursuit of employment upon completion of their programs?
- What special opportunities are provided for candidates who need special assistance? How are candidates provided with information about the availability of special assistance?
- How does the program sponsor review each candidate's competence at designated checkpoints, inform the candidates of their status, provide opportunities for corrective learning, and only then dismiss those who are determined to be unsuited for professional service?
- How are the requirements for each credential program and information about available services made accessible to prospective and current candidates?
- How well does the program sponsor ensure that each candidate is informed in writing early in his/her program about the program's prerequisites, coursework requirements, field experience requirements, and the specific deadlines for making satisfactory progress

in the program? How are candidates informed about the legal requirements for state certification? How are they also informed about the individuals who are available to provide services to them?

- In what manner is each candidate informed about program sponsor's grievance and appeal procedures?

Common Standards Issues to be Addressed

Internship Programs

For an internship program: Program Faculty develop an individual plan for the mentoring support and professional development of each intern while in the program. Because interns perform the duties of fully certificated holders of the credential, it is important that they have support in the performance of their tasks and the planning for their professional development. This support should be similar to that which is provided for new teachers hired by the district. Specifically, they should have an individual plan for professional development and the support of one or more mentor teachers. The individual plan for support and professional development is developed for each intern in consultation with the intern and the employing school district. The individual plan includes the provision for mentoring experiences.

Professional Level

At least one experienced administrator is designated as a mentor for each candidate, with stated responsibility to assist in the professional/personal development of each administrator. Once a school or school district employs a new administrator, it has an obligation to assign a mentor in order to provide ongoing assistance and support to that new administrator. Mentors are assigned equitably to all candidates in the program in order to provide assistance and support to the new administrator. Experienced administrators who consent to serve as mentors are available and accessible for periodic consultations, scheduled conferences, and occasional unscheduled conversations with new administrators in the program. The institution regularly evaluates the quality of the induction support provided to candidates and makes modifications and adjustments as needed.

An institution that prepares candidates for the Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential has an obligation to attempt to retain promising candidates who may experience difficulties during professional preparation. In consultation with the employer, the institution identifies candidates who need assistance and provides opportunities for such assistance. It is a joint responsibility of the institution and the employer to determine who is suited to practice in administrative positions. The institution, in consultation with the employer, identifies and assists each candidate who needs academic and professional assistance. Only those candidates who demonstrate the skills and knowledge necessary to be successful administrators are retained.

Standard 7

School Collaboration

For each credential preparation program, the program sponsor collaborates with local school personnel in selecting suitable school sites and effective clinical personnel for guiding candidates through a planned sequence of fieldwork/clinical experiences that is based on a well developed rationale.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist program sponsors in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- For each credential preparation program, to what extent does an effective and ongoing system of communication and collaboration exist between the program sponsor and local districts and school sites where candidates are placed for their field experiences?
- To what extent does the program sponsor, in consultation with local administrators and teachers, have clear, explicit criteria for the selection of schools and district field experience supervisors? How effectively does the program sponsor seek to place candidates in self-renewing schools in which the curriculum and the staff develop continually?
- To what extent is there a description of the fieldwork/clinical experience options that are available and how those options correspond to the organizational structure and academic requirements of each credential program?
- How does the program sponsor ensure that each credential candidate's field/clinical experiences are planned collaboratively, involving the candidate, school district personnel and program personnel?
- To what extent does the program sponsor provide opportunities for candidates to be placed in schools where computer-based technology is used to support teaching and learning?
- How thoroughly does the program sponsor periodically review the suitability and quality of all field placement sites?
- To what extent does the program sponsor review each candidate's fieldwork/clinical placement to ensure that candidates are assigned to appropriate sites supervisors?

- How well developed is the program sponsor's plan and rationale for the sequence of field experiences in each credential program?

Common Standards Issues to be Addressed

Internship Programs

For an internship program: The very nature of an internship program requires collaboration at every stage of the program. This includes the selection of district supervisors of interns, placement of interns in teaching positions and shaping and evaluation of the internship assignments.

Preliminary Level

The program sponsor secures collaboration with educational agencies in the selection of effective supervising administrators, in the placement of candidates in exemplary, well-managed schools.

Standard 8

District Field Supervisors

Each district-employed field experience supervisor is carefully selected, trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, and certified and experienced in either teaching the subject(s) of the class or performing the services authorized by the credential. District supervisors and supervisory activities are appropriately evaluated, recognized and rewarded by the program sponsor.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist program sponsors in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- How does the program sponsor ensure that each candidate's field experiences are supervised by district personnel who have state certification, academic preparation and successful experience in the credential area? How do they determine that they have remained current with changes in the profession and the student population?
- How thoroughly and promptly does the program sponsor provide for the effective role-orientation and supervisory training of each district field experience supervisor.
- To what extent does each district field experience supervisor demonstrate skills in observation and coaching techniques and in ways of successfully fostering learning in adults?
- How are fieldwork/clinical experiences evaluated collaboratively, involving the candidate, school district personnel and program personnel?
- To what extent does the program sponsor recognize and reward district field experience supervisors for their services, through letters of recognition or incentives, such as tuition credits, conference attendance allowances, or instructional materials?

Common Standards Issues to be Addressed

Internship Programs

Each intern receives support from one or more certificated person(s) who are assigned at the same school, at least one of whom is experienced in the curricular area(s) of the intern's assignment. Each person who supports one or more interns is trained in support techniques, oriented to the support role and appropriately evaluated, recognized and rewarded by the program sponsor and/or the district. Support personnel are particularly important because interns do not have the benefit of the assistance of a cooperating (supervisory) teacher as a student teacher would have.

Preconditions for the Approval of Administrative Services Credential Programs

Most associations that accredit postsecondary institutions establish "preconditions" to accreditation. So do most licensing agencies that approve professional preparation programs, or that accredit professional schools. Preconditions are requirements that must be met in order for an accrediting association or licensing agency to consider accrediting a program sponsor or approving its programs or schools. Preconditions determine a program sponsor's *eligibility*. The actual *approval* or *accreditation* of programs, schools, institutions, and other educational entities is based upon standards adopted by the association or licensing agency.

There are two categories of preconditions: (1) those established by State laws such as limitations on the length of a professional preparation program; and (2) those established by Commission policy such as the requirement that the sponsoring institution be accredited by the regional accrediting body in which the institution's home campus resides. The preconditions were originally adopted by the Commission in November, 1986. Entities that intend to offer approved programs must provide a response to each precondition. Some preconditions may require a relatively brief response, while others will require a detailed and thorough response. For example, a response to General Precondition 8 should include a list of faculty members who will be required to participate in the public schools and a three-year schedule showing when each will be expected to carry out this responsibility.

Some earlier preconditions were changed as a result of Commission action and the *Accreditation Framework*. For example, in 1998, General Precondition 2 was adopted to require entities to report on responsibility and authority for credential programs. Preconditions were also titled and placed in a different order than in prior documents. Preconditions established by the Commission under its general statutory authority are now listed first. These are preconditions that apply to all or most credential programs. (Please note that some of these preconditions apply only to initial accreditation, others apply only to continuing accreditation and others apply to both.) The general preconditions are followed by the preconditions that are established by specific sections of the Education Code and are specific to the Administrative Services Credential programs. Finally, preconditions pertaining to internship programs are included and displayed in italics. (Included with the preconditions are clarifications which may be helpful to program sponsors.)

There were some additional revisions made to the preconditions for Administrative Services Credential Programs in 2003. These changes included adding language to General Precondition 1 for preliminary credential programs and revising language in Specific Preconditions 3 and 6 for standards-based professional clear programs to address program sponsorship by entities other than colleges and universities. Specific requirements for required hours or units in various components of professional clear programs were also removed from the preconditions. A program's length and depth must still be sufficient to meet the Commission's program standards, but a minimum number of hours or units in the program is no longer specified.

General Preconditions Established by the Commission

Pursuant to Education Code §44227(a), each program of professional preparation shall adhere to the following requirements of the Commission.

- (1) **Accreditation and Academic Credit.** To be granted initial accreditation or continuing accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation as a program of professional preparation, the program must be proposed and operated by an institution of higher education that (a) is fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges or another of the six regional accrediting bodies, and (b) grants baccalaureate academic credit or post-baccalaureate academic credit, or both. This provision does not apply to alternative (non-university based) programs, however, such programs must include in their program proposal verification of the entity's governing board's approval of sponsorship of the program.
- (2) **Responsibility and Authority.** To be granted initial accreditation or continuing accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation, the institution or sponsoring agency shall provide the following information:
 - (a) Identify the position within the entity's organizational structure that is responsible for the ongoing oversight of all credential preparation programs offered by the entity (including credential programs offered by the extension division, if any).
 - (b) Provide a description of the reporting relationship between the position described in (a) and the managers who coordinate each credential program offered by the entity. If a reporting relationship is indirect, describe levels of authority and responsibility for each credential program.
- (3) **Personnel Decisions.** To be granted initial accreditation or continuing accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation, a program of professional preparation must be proposed and operated by an entity that makes all personnel decisions without considering differences due to gender or other constitutionally or legally prohibited considerations. These decisions include decisions regarding the admission, retention or graduation of students, and decisions regarding the employment, retention or promotion of employees.
- (4) **Demonstration of Need.** To be granted initial accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation as a program of professional preparation, the program proposal must include a demonstration of need for the program in the region in which it will be operated. Such a demonstration must include, but need not be limited to, assurance by a sample of school administrators that once or more school districts will, during the foreseeable future, hire or assign additional personnel to serve in the credential category.
- (5) **Practitioners' Participation in Program Design.** To be granted initial accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation as a program of professional preparation, the program proposal must include verification that practitioners in the credential category have participated actively in the design and development of the program's philosophical orientation, educational goals, and content emphases.

- (6) **Commission Assurances.** To be granted initial accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation as a program of professional preparation, the program proposal must (a) demonstrate that the program will fulfill all applicable standards if program quality and effectiveness that have been adopted by the Commission; and (b) include assurances that (b1) the entity will cooperate in an evaluation of the program by an external team or a monitoring of the program by a Commission staff member within the four years of the initial enrollment of candidates in the program, and (b2) that the program sponsor will respond to all requests for data regarding program enrollments and completions within the time limits specified by the Commission.
- (7) **Requests for Data.** To be granted continuing accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation as a program of professional preparation, the entity must respond to all requests of the Commission for data regarding program enrollments and completions within the time limits specified by the Commission.

General Preconditions Established by State Law

- (8) **Instructor Participation.** Each instructor who regularly teaches one or more courses relating to instructional methods in a program of professional preparation for teaching credentials, including Specialist Credentials, or one or more courses in administrative methods in an Administrative Services Credential Program, shall actively participate in public elementary or secondary schools and classrooms at least once every three academic years. *Reference: Education Code Section 44227.5 (a) and (b).*
- (9) **California Basic Educational Skills Test.** In each program of professional preparation, applicants for program admission shall be required to take the California Basic Educational Skills Test. The entity shall use the test results to ensure that, upon admission, each candidate receives appropriate academic assistance necessary to pass the examination. *Reference: Education Code Sections 44252(f) and 44225(n).*

Clarification of General Precondition 9

Legislative Intent. General Precondition 9 does not require passage of the CBEST for admission, only that the exam be taken. It is the intent of the Legislature that admission to a program not be denied solely on the basis of having failed to pass the CBEST. Further, it is expected that program sponsors will make provisions for assisting candidates in passing the exam.

Out of State Applicants. Persons residing outside of California when they apply for admission must take the CBEST no later than the second available administration of the test after enrolling in the program.

For Internship Programs: In each internship program of professional preparation candidates who are admitted shall be required to pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test prior to assuming intern administrative responsibilities. Reference: Education Code Section 44252(b).

- (10) Certificate of Clearance.** An entity that operates a program of professional preparation shall not allow a candidate to assume daily student teaching responsibilities or participate in field experience until a candidate obtains a Certificate of Clearance from the Commission which verifies the candidate's personal identification. *Reference: Education Code Section 44320(d)*

For Internship Programs: The Certificate of Clearance must be obtained prior to assuming intern administrative responsibilities.

Specific Preconditions Established by the Commission for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

Each program of professional preparation that leads to the issuance of a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential shall adhere continually to the following requirements of California State laws.

Prerequisite Degree and Credential. An entity that operates a program for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential shall determine, prior to recommending a candidate for the credential, that the candidate possesses a baccalaureate degree and a valid teaching credential; or a services credential with a specialization in pupil personnel services, library services, health services, or clinical rehabilitative services; or a designated subjects credential and a baccalaureate degree. *Statutory basis: Education Code Section 44270(a)(1).*

For Internship Programs: An entity that operates a program of preparation for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential with an Internship shall require each candidate who is admitted into an Internship Program to possess the appropriate prerequisite credential prior to assuming internship administrative responsibilities. Statutory basis: Education Code Section 44270(a)(1).

Experience Requirement. An entity that operates a program for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential shall determine, prior to recommending a candidate for the credential, that the candidate has verified experience of a minimum of three years of successful, full-time classroom teaching in public or private schools; or three years of experience appropriate to the services credential listed in (1) above; or three years of experience with a designated subjects credential. *Statutory basis: Education Code Section 44270(a)(2).*

For Internship Programs: An entity that operates a program of preparation for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential with an Internship shall determine that each candidate who is admitted into an Internship Program has verified experience of a minimum of three years of successful full-time teaching or services as described above prior to assuming internship administrative responsibilities. Statutory basis: Education Code Section 44270(a)(2).

Preconditions Established in State Law for Internship Programs

For initial and continuing accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation, participating districts and universities must adhere to the following requirements of state law.

Bachelor's Degree Requirement. *Candidates admitted to internship programs must hold baccalaureate degrees or higher from a regionally accredited institution of higher education. Reference: Education Code Section 44453.*

Supervision of Interns. *In an internship program, the participating institutions shall provide supervision of all interns. No intern's salary may be reduced by more than 1/8 of its total to pay for supervision, and the salary of the intern shall not be less than the minimum base salary paid to a regularly certificated person. If the intern salary is reduced, no more than eight interns may be advised by one district support person. (Reference: Education Code Section 44462.) Institutions will describe the procedures used in assigning supervisors and, where applicable, the system used to pay for supervision.*

Assignment and Authorization. *To receive approval, the participating institution authorizes the candidates in an internship program to assume the functions that are authorized by the regular standard credential. (Reference: Education Code Section 44454.) The institution stipulates that the interns' services meet the instructional or service needs of the participating district(s). (Reference: Education Code Section 44458.)*

Participating Districts. *Participating districts are public school districts or county office of education. Submissions for approval must identify the specific districts involved and the specific credential involved. (Reference: Education Code Section 44321 and 44452.)*

Specific Preconditions Established by the Commission for Internship Programs

For initial and continuing accreditation, participating districts and universities must adhere to the following requirements established by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Non-Displacement of Certificated Employees. *The institution and participating districts must certify that interns do not displace certificated employees in participating districts.*

Justification of Internship Program. *Where an institution submits a program for initial and continuing accreditation, it must explain why the internship is being implemented. Programs that are developed to meet employment shortages must include a statement from the participating district(s) about the availability of qualified certificated persons holding the credential. The exclusive representative of certificated employees in the credential area (when applicable) is encouraged to submit a written statement to the Committee on Accreditation agreeing or disagreeing with the justification that is submitted.*

Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Programs

Category I: Program Design, Coordination and Curriculum

Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design

The professional leadership preparation program includes a purposeful, developmental, interrelated sequence of learning experiences – some that are carried out in the field and some that occur in non-field settings – that effectively prepare candidates as instructional leaders in a variety of public schools and school districts. The design of the program is based on a sound rationale informed by theory and research aligned with (a) the principles articulated in the Candidate Competence and Performance Standards in Category III, and (b) the principles of various learning theories. The program is designed to provide extensive opportunities for candidates to learn and apply, and includes both formative and summative assessments based on the Candidate Competence and Performance Standards in Category III.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 1(a) The design of the program contains essential principles that are clearly grounded in a well reasoned rationale, which draws on sound scholarship and theory anchored to the knowledge base of administrator preparation, is articulated clearly, and is evident in the delivery of the program's coursework and fieldwork.
- 1(b) The program design and its delivery form a cohesive set of learning experiences that are informed by adult learning theories and are designed to address the emerging, developing needs of prospective administrators enrolled in the program.
- 1(c) The program incorporates multi-media technologies to ensure that candidates develop an understanding of the importance, role and uses of technology for instructional support, administrative decision-making and the management of data in schools.
- 1(d) The design of the coursework and fieldwork experiences provides each candidate with opportunities to learn about and manage the use of technology for the improvement of the instructional program.
- 1(e) The program has an organizational structure that provides for coordination of the administrative components of the program that facilitates each candidate's completion of the program.

- 1(f) Coursework and field experiences utilize a variety of strategies for professional instruction and provide multiple opportunities for candidates to learn and practice the Candidate Competence and Performance Standards in Category III, including opportunities to observe administrative practices in diverse settings.
- 1(g) *For an internship program, the design makes allowance for the fact that interns do not have all of the "theoretical" background desirable for successful service at the beginning of the program. Interns are given multiple, systematic opportunities to combine theory with practice. The program design clearly recognizes the particular needs of interns and provides an array of support systems designed to meet the needs of interns and non-interns enrolled in the program.*
- 1(h) The program design includes planned processes for the comprehensive assessment of individual candidates on all competencies addressed in the program. Criteria are established for individual candidate competency and a clear definition of satisfactory completion of the program is established and utilized to make individual recommendations for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. The program sponsor ensures that each candidate demonstrates satisfactory mastery of the Candidate Competence and Performance Standards in Category III at a level appropriate for beginning administrators.

Standard 2: Program Coordination

Each sponsor of an administrative preparation program establishes one or more partnerships that contribute substantively to the quality and effectiveness of the design and implementation of each candidate's preparation. Partnerships address significant aspects of professional preparation. An agreement between the partners is cooperatively established and the terms and agreements of the partnership are binding on both parties with each partner sharing the responsibility for the implementation and success of the program.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 2(a) The sponsor of a professional leadership preparation program establishes one or more intensive partnerships with representatives of schools where candidates engage in program-based fieldwork. The program-based fieldwork component offers opportunities for purposeful involvement in cooperative partnership(s) for the design and delivery of programs by various interest groups such as parent and community organizations, institutions of higher education, professional organizations, county offices of education, educational research centers, business representatives, and other groups.
- 2(b) Each partnership includes purposeful, substantive dialogue in which the partners contribute to the structured design of the professional leadership preparation program and monitor its implementation on a continuing basis. Dialogue between partners effectively assists in the identification and resolution of program issues and candidate needs.
- 2(c) Partners establish working relationships, coordinate joint efforts, and rely on each other for contributions to program quality. In discussing program issues, partners value the multiple perspectives of the respective members and draw openly on members' knowledge, professional expertise and practical skills.
- 2(d) Partners cooperate in developing program policies and reviewing program practices pertaining to the recruitment, selection and advisement of candidates; development of curriculum; delivery of instruction; selection of field sites; design of field experiences; selection and preparation of field experience supervisors; and assessment and verification of administrator competence.
- 2(e) Cooperating partners recognize the critical importance of administrator preparation by substantively supporting the costs of cooperation through contributions of sufficient human and fiscal resources.

Standard 3: Development of Professional Perspectives

By design, the program facilitates each candidate's development of a professional perspective by providing extensive opportunities to analyze implement and reflect on the relationships between theory and practice concerning leadership, teaching, and learning in the context of contemporary school issues in California. The program offers exposure to the essential themes, concepts and skills related to the performance of administrative services, including but not limited to: relationship building; communication skills; the ability to articulate, apply and evaluate theories of leadership; an understanding of and ability to apply, model, and analyze curriculum, instructional strategies, and assessment; an understanding of standards-based accountability systems; and the ability to use data to make decisions regarding program improvement. The program develops each candidate's understanding of how successful resource management affects successful instructional leadership.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 3(a) By design, the program builds on and enhances each candidate's understanding of the state-adopted academic content standards for students. Candidates develop an understanding of the nature of instructional leadership and the responsibilities of an administrator with respect to monitoring student performance, including those students with special needs, using a range of indicators; evaluating and supervising instructional faculty and staff; and evaluating, planning for and implementing short- and long-term professional development strategies to improve the overall performance of all students.
- 3(b) In the program, the structured design of coursework and fieldwork includes coherent recurring review, discussion and analysis of a broad range of foundational issues and theories and their relationships to professional practices in schools and classrooms.
- 3(c) As candidates begin professional development, the program encourages them to examine their own leadership practices. Through reflection, analysis, and discussion of these practices, each candidate learns to make informed decisions about teaching, learning and instructional leadership.
- 3(d) *For an internship, the program shall ensure that, prior to beginning the intern assignment, all candidates have a basic understanding of the foundations of administrative practice and an understanding of their specific job responsibilities.*

Standard 4: Equity, Diversity and Access

The professional leadership preparation program provides each candidate with an opportunity to examine and reflect upon principles of educational equity and diversity and their implementation in school sites, including access to curriculum content and school practices for all students, teachers, staff, parents or caregivers and community members. The program prepares candidates to provide all students and their parents and guardians equitable access to the school, including the curriculum and other programmatic supports in the school. Through coursework and fieldwork, candidates examine their personal attitudes toward race, gender and socio-economic status; learn about ways to examine and confront issues around race, equity and diversity; and take leadership roles in discussions about equity, diversity and access. Candidates know the protections afforded by Education Code Chapter 587, Statutes of 1999 and learn how to work to ensure educational equity for all members of the school community. The program includes a series of planned experiences in which candidates learn to identify, analyze and minimize personal and institutional bias.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 4(a) The program prepares candidates to effectively lead a school site by increasing the knowledge of the diverse constituencies that comprise the extended school community with respect to background experiences, languages, skills and abilities of student populations, including accommodations for students with special needs.
- 4(b) The program prepares candidates to supervise the application of appropriate pedagogical practices that provide access to the core curriculum and lead to high achievement for all students.
- 4(c) The program design includes the study and discussion of the historical and cultural traditions of the major racial, religious and ethnic groups in California society and an examination of effective ways to include cultural traditions and community values in the school curriculum and school activities.
- 4(d) The program design is explicit in developing each candidate's ability to recognize historical and philosophical forces that have given rise to institutional practices, such as systemic forms of racism and sexism, that serve to limit students' access to academic and social success and to create a safe and equitable school setting that establishes and contributes to the physical, social, emotional and intellectual safety of the diverse constituencies of the extended school community.

- 4(e) The program provides ongoing opportunities for each candidate to systematically examine their stated and implied personal attitudes and expectations about race, ethnicity, culture, sexual orientation, religion and socio-economic status to foster a school environment that creates access to the curriculum and programs of the schools and maintains high expectations for the academic achievement of all participants in all contexts.
- 4(f) The program provides ongoing opportunities for each candidate to systematically examine their stated and implied personal attitudes and expectations related to gender and to develop school policy and curriculum that creates and supports a gender-fair environment within the school community.
- 4(g) The program develops each candidate's capacity to recognize students' specific learning needs; develop policy and practices at the school site to ascertain student needs and place students in appropriate learning contexts; collaborate with teachers in developing instructional practices that guarantee full access to the curriculum; and identify and provide resources for all students to have full access to the curriculum and opportunities to engage in extracurricular and co-curricular activities.
- 4(h) The program develops each candidate's understanding of the legal and financial implications of serving students with special needs.

Standard 5: Role of Schooling in a Democratic Society

The professional leadership preparation program provides each candidate with an opportunity to examine the principles of democratic education from a historical and policy perspective. The program prepares each candidate to understand the role of the school in preparing students as future citizens and to identify and analyze the variety of ideas and forces in society that contribute to a democratic society. The program prepares administrators who understand their responsibility in developing and nurturing public support, family participation, community engagement, labor relations and preparing students for the challenges of the future. The program includes the study of how historical and philosophical forces, as well as policy decisions and prevailing practices, have an impact on schooling.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 5(a) The program prepares candidates to discuss, debate and articulate the purposes of schooling in a democratic society.
- 5(b) The program includes opportunities to understand the values and concerns of the diverse communities that constitute a democracy and the importance of involving the greater community in the life of schools.
- 5(c) The program includes opportunities for the candidate to explore the relationship of schools to the school community, governmental entities and community agencies and the role of integrating community service as well as resources for children and families in the school.
- 5(d) The program provides each candidate with an opportunity to understand the relationship between federal, state and local policy and practice with respect to the role that government policy has in ensuring democratic education for all students.
- 5(e) The program provides each candidate with an opportunity to (1) learn about federal, state and local laws, policies and practices that ensure appropriate accommodations for students with various learning styles and students with disabilities, and (2) understand the role of the site administrator in monitoring and implementing these provisions of law.
- 5(f) The program provides each candidate with an opportunity to understand labor relations, contract compliance and collective bargaining as it relates to schooling in a democratic society.
- 5(g) The program provides each candidate with an opportunity to understand the role of families and their diverse structures and cultural beliefs as they impact the role of schooling in a democratic society.

Standard 6: Opportunities to Learn Instructional Leadership

The professional leadership preparation program provides multiple opportunities in the program curriculum for each candidate to learn, practice and reflect on the role of instructional leaders as delineated in the standards of candidate competence and performance in Category III. The role of the instructional leader is central to the functioning of an effective school, and thus the program provides multiple, systematic opportunities for the candidate to connect theory to practice and develop the knowledge, skill and disposition to foster effective teaching in the service of student achievement. The program curriculum prepares each candidate to view all aspects of leadership through the lens of student learning. The program includes comprehensive, systematic formative and summative assessments that address the full range of competencies described in Category III.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 6(a) Shared Vision of Learning The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn to facilitate the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of teaching and learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
 - 6(a)(1) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to develop and refine a personal vision of education and instruction and provides multiple opportunities for the candidate to engage in reflection, develop ways to engage self and others reflective activities, and addresses the need for reflection across the program.
 - 6(a)(2) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to develop and implement a shared vision and goals that place student and adult learning at the center of instructional leadership.
 - 6(a)(3) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to establish, support, and maintain high expectations and standards for the academic and social development of all students, the performance of staff and the contributions of all adults in the service of the shared vision of the school community.
 - 6(a)(4) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to engage in multiple and systematic opportunities to practice various methods of effective communication that support the implementation of the vision of the school community and the infusion of the vision in the instructional program.
 - 6(a)(5) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn and apply strategies for guiding, motivating, delegating, and building consensus among the diverse constituencies in the school and community to develop, articulate, implement and steward a shared vision of teaching and learning.

- 6(b) Culture of Teaching and Learning The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to advocate, nurture, and sustain a school culture and instructional program that is conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. Coursework and fieldwork focus on the implementation of state adopted academic content standards, frameworks and instructional materials as well as assessment and accountability systems.
- 6(b)(1) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to apply learning, curricular, and instructional theory to the design, implementation and evaluation of standards-based instruction and assessment programs and lead in the improvement of those programs.
 - 6(b)(2) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to become a critical consumer of educational research and to use research and site based data to design, implement, support, evaluate, and improve instructional programs and to drive the professional development of staff.
 - 6(b)(3) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to study and apply their knowledge of diverse learning styles and differentiated instruction strategies that address the needs of all learners and staff.
 - 6(b)(4) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to use data, including the use of technological applications, and to develop, manage, and evaluate strategies to improve student achievement.
 - 6(b)(5) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to develop cooperatively and guide the ongoing and long-term professional development of all staff consistent with the ongoing effort to improve the learning of all students.
 - 6(b)(6) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to develop and use skills in shared leadership and decision-making and to engage all members of the school community in the service of student learning.
- 6(c) Management of the School in the Service of Teaching and Learning The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to ensure the management of the organization, operations and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. The program includes the study and application of organizational theory that reflects effective leadership and management concepts and strategies that contribute to student achievement and the professional participation of all adults in the school community.
- 6(c)(1) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn and practice effective methods for attracting, inducting, motivating, retaining, and supporting staff and for the monitoring and supervision of certificated and non-certificated faculty and staff.
 - 6(c)(2) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn and practice effective methods for working with certificated and classified staff with disabilities.

- 6(c)(3) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to evaluate the effectiveness of an instructional program through the use of data and accountability systems.
- 6(c)(4) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to apply the principles of effective communication, systems management, organization, problem-solving and collaborative decision-making skills.
- 6(c)(5) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to set short and long-term goals, particularly with respect to cooperatively developing a site-based plan that is effectively aligned with state and district requirements and systematically links resources to the goals and objectives.
- 6(c)(6) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to develop an understanding of the legal and policy requirements with regard to safety for the purpose of assuring that the school provides a safe, well-maintained and productive environment for learning.
- 6(c)(7) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to understand and manage legal and contractual agreements and records in ways that foster a professional work environment and secure the privacy and confidentiality of all students, families and staff, including the respective roles of administrators and the unions in these processes.
- 6(c)(8) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to examine management with respect to establishing, implementing and maintaining student behavior management systems that demonstrate adherence to equity, legal and policy requirements.
- 6(c)(9) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to coordinate and equitably align fiscal, human and material resources with the school planning process in the support of learning of all students and all groups of students.
- 6(d) Working With Diverse Families And Communities The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to work effectively with families, caregivers and community members; recognize the goals and aspirations of diverse families; respond to diverse community interests and needs; and mobilize community resources in the service of student achievement. In this regard, the program offers the candidate an opportunity to examine and evaluate their attitudes toward people of different races, cultures, and ethnic backgrounds as well as examine their attitudes toward sexual orientation and individuals with disabilities so they will be able to be an effective leader in a diverse setting and value individuals from different family structures, religions, races, cultures, socio-economic status and ethnic backgrounds, and treat them with fairness and respect.
- 6(d)(1) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to incorporate family and community expectations in school decision-making and activities.
- 6(d)(2) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to establish community partnerships that will benefit the students, teachers, families, and school

community and be able to mobilize and leverage community resources for the equitable access of all students and groups of students.

- 6(d)(3) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to understand how to facilitate parent involvement and parent education activities that support students' success.
 - 6(d)(4) The program provides multiple opportunities for the candidate to learn how to effectively communicate information about the school on a regular and predictable basis through a variety of media and modes.
 - 6(d)(5) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn about appropriate resources and strategies for addressing language diversity in schools, with particular emphasis on the responsibility to communicate to families whose primary home language is a language other than English.
 - 6(d)(6) The program provides opportunities for each candidate to examine their personal attitudes and actions toward persons of different races, socio-economic status, cultures, religions and ethnic backgrounds as well as their attitudes toward sexual orientation and individuals with disabilities and reflect upon how their attitudes and actions support or diminish the goal to ensure that all students receive equitable access to education.
- 6(e) Personal Ethics and Leadership Capacity. The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to examine, practice and model a personal code of ethics, including protecting the rights and confidentiality of students, staff and families. The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to practice professional leadership capacity, including shared decision-making, problem-solving and conflict management and foster those skills in others. The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to examine site and district responsibilities with regard to students with special needs. The program develops each candidate's ability to effectively act as a spokesperson for the school to the extended school community. The candidate has multiple opportunities to model personal and professional ethics, integrity, justice and fairness and receive feedback from the program and peers; reflect on personal leadership beliefs and practices and recognize their impact and influence on the performance of others; and develop mechanisms for sustaining personal motivation, commitment, energy, and health by learning to balance professional and personal responsibilities.
- 6(e)(1) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to engage in decision-making, problem-solving, change management, planning, conflict management, and evaluation and reflect upon the learning from these opportunities for practice in course work and field work.
 - 6(e)(2) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to communicate decisions based on relevant data and research about effective teaching and learning, leadership, management practices, equity, and access.
 - 6(e)(3) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to encourage and inspire others to higher levels of performance, commitment, and motivation and

to communicate knowledge effectively about the curriculum and its articulation across programs and grade levels to multiple audiences in the school and community.

- 6(e)(4) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to utilize technology in the service of fostering effective and timely communication with all members of the school community.
- 6(f) Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Understanding. The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn about political, societal, economic, legal and cultural influences on schools. By augmenting the candidate's knowledge of these interconnections, the program develops the candidate's ability to understand, respond to, and influence the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural context of schools and leadership. The program content should provide opportunities for the candidate to practice both team leadership and team membership so that the candidate can effectively generate and participate in communication with key decision-makers in the school community. The candidate has an opportunity to learn how to view himself or herself as a leader of a team and as a member of a team by engaging in course work and field work that provides opportunities to both lead and work collaboratively.
 - 6(f)(1) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn about and analyze how a school must operate consistently within the parameters of federal, state, and local laws, policies, regulations, contractual and statutory requirements.
 - 6(f)(2) The program provides an opportunity for each candidate to examine the context within which the school operates, including the school district, employee bargaining units, the school board, and other governmental entities and to understand how the policies from several levels of government influence teaching and learning at the school site.
 - 6(f)(3) The program provides opportunities for the candidate to engage in discussions and successfully address authentic, complex school issues, including meeting the needs of students and staff with disabilities, evaluating employees, providing appropriate services in different settings to English learners, ensuring school safety, administering student behavior programs, and addressing harassment.
 - 6(f)(4) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn about public policies that ensure equitable distribution of resources and support for all groups of students.
 - 6(f)(5) The program provides an opportunity for the candidate to learn how to create a welcoming school environment for the public, be responsive to diverse community and constituent views, and create and facilitate constructive conversations about how to improve student learning and achievement.

Category II: Field Experiences in the Standards

Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences

In the program of administrator preparation, candidates participate in significant field experiences that are designed to facilitate the application of theoretical concepts in practical settings. Each candidate addresses the major duties and responsibilities authorized by the administrative services credential in a variety of realistic settings. Field experiences include intensive experiences both in the day-to-day functions of administrators and in longer-term policy design and implementation.

For an internship program: For this standard, the definition of "field experiences" includes, but is not limited to, the responsibilities of the internship assignment.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 7(a) The field experience responsibilities are closely related to the job performance requirements of administrators.
- 7(b) Linkages are made between the field experiences and the content of coursework in school administration.
- 7(c) The program provides appropriate, on-site direction to the quality of the field experience assignments, including identification of an on-site and/or school-based mentor.
- 7(d) Significant, intensive field experiences occur in at least one setting in which the candidate is able to perform a wide range of the typical responsibilities of a full-time administrator.
- 7(e) Authentic and significant experiences addressing a variety of school levels and a variety of school settings are required for each candidate, including field experiences, at least one of which involves a site with a diverse school population.
- 7(f) Field experiences include opportunities to deal with long term educational policy issues in the school or district.
- 7(g) *For an internship program, an assessment of the internship assignment is made to determine what additional experiences need to be planned for the candidate to provide a full range of administrative experiences.*
- 7(h) *For an internship program, specific supplementary administrative experiences are assigned to interns on the basis of the above assessment.*

Standard 8: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback

The program sponsor has an effective system by which the candidate's performance is guided, assisted and evaluated in each field experience. In this system, at least one supervising administrator and at least one program supervisor provide complete, accurate and timely feedback to the candidate.

For an internship program: For this standard, the definition of "field experiences" includes, but is not limited to, the responsibilities of the internship assignment.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 8(a) Guidance, assistance, and feedback encompass all of the components of the Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance in Category III which occur in the field experiences.
- 8(b) The support and assessment of each candidate is coordinated effectively between the candidate's supervising administrator(s), program supervisor(s) and the candidate.
- 8(c) The information given to each candidate about their performance accurately and fully describes strengths and weaknesses and provides constructive suggestions for improvement.
- 8(d) The final field experience evaluation is made by the program supervisor with the involvement of the supervising administrator and the candidate.

Category III: Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance

Prior to recommending each candidate for a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, one or more persons responsible for the program determine on the basis of thoroughly documented evidence that each candidate has demonstrated a satisfactory performance on the full range of standards of candidate competence and performance in Standards 10 through 15 of Category III. Satisfactory performance is defined as achieving at least minimal competence as expected for entry-level administrators, and appropriate for the developmental stage of each candidate. During the program, candidates are guided and coached on their performance in relation to the standards of candidate competence and performance using formative assessment processes. Verification of candidate competence is provided by a representative of the program sponsor and at least one district supervisor.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 9(a) By design, candidates are assessed through the use of formative assessments embedded throughout the program and a summative assessment at the program's conclusion. Candidates are informed of the expectations for their performance, guided and coached in the completion of formative assessment tasks that prepare them for summative assessment, and provided timely feedback on their performance in relation to the standards of candidate competence and performance in Category III.
- 9(b) There is a systematic summative assessment administered by qualified individuals who are knowledgeable about the standards of candidate competence in Category III. Candidates are assessed using documented procedures or instruments that are clear, fair and effective.
- 9(c) The assessment is administered by the program sponsor and includes at least one program supervisor.
- 9(d) The assessment includes two or more assessment methods such as performance, portfolio, presentation, research project, field-experience journal, work sample, interview, oral examination and written examination.
- 9(e) The systematic procedures that govern the summative assessment include a defensible process and criteria, such as rubrics, for evaluating performance, an appeal process, and a procedure for candidates to repeat portions of the assessment as needed.
- 9(f) One or more persons who are responsible for the program recommend candidates for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential on the basis of all available information of each candidate's competence and performance.

- 9(g) The program sponsor ensures that thorough records of each candidate's performance in the summative assessment are maintained.
- 9(h) The program staff periodically evaluates the quality, fairness and effectiveness of assessment practices and uses assessment data as one source of information about the quality of the preparation program.
- 9(i) The program includes a clearly specified process for making credential recommendations and verifying that candidates have completed all requirements before recommending them for the credential.

Standard 10: Vision of Learning

Each candidate is able to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 10(a) Each candidate is able to facilitate the development of a shared vision for the achievement of all students based upon data from multiple measures of student learning and relevant qualitative indicators.
- 10(b) Each candidate is able to articulate and demonstrate strategies for implementing the shared vision so that the entire school community understands and acts on the mission of the school as a standards-based educational system.
- 10(c) Each candidate knows how to leverage and marshal sufficient resources to implement and attain the vision for all students and subgroups of students.
- 10(d) Each candidate can identify and address barriers to accomplishing the vision.
- 10(e) Each candidate is able to shape school programs, plans, and activities to ensure integration, articulation, and consistency with the vision.
- 10(f) Each candidate is able to use the influence of diversity to improve teaching and learning.

Standard 11: Student Learning and Professional Growth

Each candidate is able to promote the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 11(a) Each candidate understands and is able to create an accountability system of teaching and learning based on student learning standards.
- 11(b) Each candidate is able to use research and site-base data to design, implement, support, evaluate and improve instructional programs and to drive professional development of staff.
- 11(c) Each candidate utilizes multiple assessment measures to evaluate student learning to drive an ongoing process of inquiry focused on improving the learning of all students and all subgroups of students.
- 11(d) Each candidate knows how to shape a culture where high expectations for all students and for all subgroups of students is the core purpose.
- 11(e) Each candidate is able to guide and support the long-term professional development of all staff consistent with the ongoing effort to improve the learning of all students relative to state-adopted academic performance standards for students.
- 11(f) Each candidate promotes equity, fairness, and respect among all members of the school community.
- 11(g) Each candidate is able to provide opportunities for parents and all other members of the school community to develop and use skills in collaboration, leadership, and shared responsibility.
- 11(h) Each candidate knows and is able to support the use of state-adopted learning materials and a wide array of learning strategies to support student learning.
- 11(i) Each candidate coordinates the design, implementation and evaluation of instructional programs that serve the diverse learning styles and needs of all students and lead in the continual development and improvement of those programs.
- 11(j) Each candidate utilizes technological tools to manage and evaluate instructional programs and promote and support the use of technology in instruction and learning.

Standard 12: Organizational Management for Student Learning

Each candidate promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 12(a) Each candidate is able to monitor and supervise faculty and staff at the site, and manage and evaluate the instructional program.
- 12(b) Each candidate can establish school operations, patterns, and processes that support student learning.
- 12(c) Each candidate understands and is able to manage legal and contractual policies, agreements and records in ways that foster a professional work environment and secure privacy and confidentiality for all students and staff.
- 12(d) Each candidate demonstrates the ability to coordinate and align fiscal, faculty, staff, volunteer, community and material resources to support the learning of all students and all groups of students.
- 12(e) Each candidate demonstrates the ability to sustain a safe, efficient, clean, well-maintained, and productive school environment that nurtures student learning and supports the professional growth of teachers and support staff.
- 12(f) Each candidate is able to utilize the principles of systems management, organizational development, problem solving, and collaborative decision-making techniques fairly and effectively.
- 12(g) Each candidate is able to utilize effective and positive nurturing practices in establishing student behavior management systems.
- 12(h) Each candidate demonstrates the ability to utilize successful staff recruitment, selection and induction approaches, and understand the collective bargaining process, including the role of administrator and the union.
- 12(i) Each candidate is able to effectively evaluate and use a wide range of technologies, including assistive technologies when appropriate, to support instruction and effective school administration.
- 12(j) Each candidate is able to effectively use technology to manage multiple types of databases within a school and to use data to improve instruction.

Standard 13: Working with Diverse Families and Communities

Each candidate promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 13(a) Each candidate is able to incorporate information about family and community expectations into school decision making and activities.
- 13(b) Each candidate recognizes the goals and aspirations of diverse family and community groups.
- 13(c) Each candidate values diverse community stakeholder groups and treats all with fairness and with respect.
- 13(d) Each candidate demonstrates the ability to support the equitable success of all students and all subgroups of students through the mobilization and leveraging of community support services.
- 13(e) Each candidate knows how to strengthen the school through the establishment of community partnerships, business, institutional, and civic partnerships.
- 13(f) Each candidate is able to effectively communicate information about the school on a regular and predictable basis through a variety of media and modes.
- 13(g) Each candidate is able to facilitate parent involvement and parent education activities that support students' success.

Standard 14: Personal Ethics and Leadership Capacity

Each candidate promotes the success of all students by modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 14(a) Each candidate demonstrates skills in shared decision making, problem solving, change management, planning, conflict management, and evaluation, and fosters and develops those skills in others.
- 14(b) Each candidate models personal and professional ethics, integrity, justice, and fairness and expects the same behaviors from others.
- 14(c) Each candidate demonstrates the ability to make and communicate decisions based upon relevant data and research about effective teaching and learning, leadership, management practices, and equity.
- 14(d) Each candidate is able to utilize technology to foster effective and timely communication to all members of the school community.
- 14(e) Each candidate is able to reflect on personal leadership practices and recognize their impact and influence on the performance of others.
- 14(f) Each candidate demonstrates the ability to encourage and inspire others to higher levels of performance, commitment, and motivation.
- 14(g) Each candidate knows how to sustain personal motivation, commitment, energy, and health by balancing professional and personal responsibilities.
- 14(h) Each candidate engages in professional and personal development.
- 14(i) Each candidate demonstrates knowledge of the curriculum and the ability to integrate and articulate programs throughout the grades.
- 14(j) Each candidate knows how to use the influence of a position of leadership to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain.
- 14(k) Each candidate protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff.

Standard 15: Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Understanding

Each candidate promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

An accreditation team determines whether the preliminary preparation program meets this standard based on evidence provided by the program. The team must determine that the quality of the program has been clearly and effectively substantiated in relation to the following elements.

- 15(a) Each candidate understands their role as a leader of a team and is able to clarify the roles and relationships of individuals within the school.
- 15(b) Each candidate is able to ensure that the school operates consistently within the parameters of federal, state, and local laws, policies, regulations, statutory and fiscal requirements.
- 15(c) Each candidate demonstrates responsiveness to diverse community and constituent views and groups and generate support for the school by two-way communication with key decision makers in the school community.
- 15(d) Each candidate knows how to work with the governing board and district and local leaders to influence policies that benefit students and support the improvement of teaching and learning.
- 15(e) Each candidate knows how to influence and support public policies that ensure the equitable distribution of resources and support for all the subgroups of students.
- 15(f) Each candidate is able to welcome and facilitate constructive conversations about how to improve student learning and achievement.

Appendix B

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Box 944270

Sacramento, California 94244-2700

(916) 445-7254



PROFESSIONAL SERVICES DIVISION

MEMORANDUM

January 10, 2005

To: Larry Birch

From: Jim Alford

Re: Initial Accreditation for Santa Barbara County Education Office

I have reviewed the documents submitted by Santa Barbara CEO for their proposed Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program. They have satisfactorily addressed all applicable preconditions, including providing minutes from their 6/3/04 Governing Board meeting that show that the Board formally took action to support the Instructional Services Office's plan to offer a preparation program for new administrators. I found that all preconditions are met, and I reviewed their responses to both the Common Standards and applicable program standards and found that those responses are complete and suitable for forwarding to field reviewers for the formal review of the program standards. All documents are here and available for review as needed. Based on these findings I have concluded that SBCEO meets the requirements for initial accreditation and request that we take the proposal to the Commission for action.

Appendix C

California State University, Long Beach Single Subject Credential in English

Core Requirements for the English credential subject matter program:

English 310	Applied Composition	4 Units
English 320	English Grammar	4 Units
English 363	Shakespeare 1	4 Units
English 375	American Ethnic Writers	3 Units
English 380	Approaches to English Studies	4 Units
English 410	Theories of Writing and Literacy	3 Units
English 482	Literature for Adolescents	3 Units
Ling 339	Linguistics for Cross-Cultural Academic Development	3 Units

One of the following:

English 250A	Survey of English Literature	4 Units
Or		
English 250B	Survey of English Literature	4 Units

One of the following:

English 270A	Survey of American Literature	4 Units
Or		
English 270B	Survey of American Literature	4 Units

One of the following:

CWL 100 (GE)	World Literature	3 Units
CWL 101	Greek Mythology	3 Units
CWL 124	Intro to World Theatre and Drama	3 Units
CWL 232	Folklore and Mythology	3 Units
CWL 320I (GE)	The Comic Spirit	3 Units
CWL 346	Readings in World Poetry	3 Units
CWL 404	Women and World Literature	3 Units
CWL 452	Studies in Mythology	3 Units

12 Units in one of the following emphases:

Black Studies
Speech Communications
Creative Writing
Journalism
Language and Linguistics
Literacy and Composition
Literature
Theatre Arts
World Literature

Appendix D

English Teacher Preparation in California: Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Subject Matter Programs

**A Handbook for
Teacher Educators
&
Program Reviewers**



Revised as of December 2, 2004

English Teacher Preparation in California: Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Subject Matter Programs

**Created and Recommended by the
English Subject Matter Advisory Panel
(2001-2003)**



**Adopted and implemented by the
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
State of California
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814
2003**

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Gray Davis, Governor
State of California

2003

Commission Members

Margaret Fortune, Chair	Public Representative
Lawrence Madkins, Vice Chair	Teacher
Kristen Beckner	Teacher
Alan Bersin	Administrator
Chellyn Boquiren	Teacher
Beth Hauk	Teacher
Elaine C. Johnson	Public Representative
Steve Lilly	Faculty Member
Alberto Vaca	Teacher
Marilyn Whirry	Designee, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

Ex-Officio Members

Karen Gallagher	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Athena Waite	Regents, University of California
Sara Lundquist	California Postsecondary Education Commission
Bill Wilson	California State University

Executive Officers

Sam W. Swofford	Executive Director
Beth Graybill	Interim Director, Professional Services Division
Larry Birch	Administrator, Program Evaluation

The English Teacher Subject Matter Advisory Panel

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing 2001-03

Panelists	Professional Positions	Educational Organizations
John White	English Department Chair	California State University, Fullerton
Helen Anderson-Cruz	Professor of English	University of Southern California
Bernadette Cheyne	Professor of Drama	Humboldt State University
Darryl Eisele	English Department Chair	California State University, Chico
June Gatewood	Teacher of English	San Juan Unified School District
Katherine Kinney	Professor of English	University of California, Riverside
Peter Kittle	Professor of English	California State University, Chico
Kiran Kumar	Teacher of English	Pomona Unified School District
Carol D. Lord	Professor of Linguistics	California State University, Long Beach
Catharine M. Lucas	Professor of English	San Francisco State University
Kim V. Morin	Professor of Drama	California State University, Fresno
Terri Munroe	Teacher of English	Newport-Mesa Unified School District
Jeannine D. Richison	English Coordinator	California Polytechnic University
Dennis Wymbs	English Coordinator	San Diego County Office of Education
Christine Stempson	Teacher of English	Escondido Union High School District
Carol Tyson	Teacher of English	Beverly Hills Unified School District

Commission Consultants to the Advisory Panel:

Helen Hawley

California Department of Education Liaison to the Panel:

Beth Brenneman

Commission Secretary to the Advisory Panel:

Margaret Rich

English Teacher Preparation in California: Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Subject Matter Programs

Table of Contents

Part 1: Introduction to English Teaching Standards

Standards and Credentials for Teachers of English: A Foreword by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing	1
Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness.....	2
Standards for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs.....	3
Subject Matter Preparation Programs for Prospective Teachers.....	4
Subject Matter Advisory Panels.....	4
Essential Documents for Panel Use.....	5
Field Review Survey	6
The English Teaching Credential.....	7
Alignment of Program Standards and Performance Assessments	7
New Subject Matter Assessments	8
Overview of the English Standards Handbook	8
Contributions of the English Advisory Panel	9
Request for Assistance from Handbook Users.....	9
English Teaching and Teacher Education: Introduction by the Advisory Panel	10

Part 2: Standards of Program Quality in English

Definitions of Key Terms.....	12
Preconditions for the Approval of Subject Matter Programs in English.....	13
Category I: Standards Common to All Single Subject Matter Preparation Programs	15
Standard 1 Program Philosophy and Purpose.....	15
Standard 2 Diversity and Equity.....	16
Standard 3 Technology.....	17
Standard 4 Literacy	18
Standard 5 Varied Teaching Strategies	19
Standard 6 Early Field Experiences	20
Standard 7 Assessment of Subject Matter Competence.....	21
Standard 8 Advisement and Support.....	22
Standard 9 Program Review and Evaluation.....	23
Standard 10 Coordination.....	24
Category II: Program Standards	25
Standard 11 Required Subjects of Study.....	25
Standard 12 Extended Studies	26
Standard 13 Literature and Textual Analysis	27

Standard 14	Language, Linguistics and Literacy	28
Standard 15	Composition and Rhetoric	29
Standard 16	Communications: Speech, Media, and Creative Performance.....	30
Subject Matter Requirements for Prospective Teachers of English.....		31
Content Domains for Subject Matter Understanding and Skill in English.....		31
Domain 1.	Literature and Textual Analysis	31
Domain 2.	Language, Linguistics, and Literacy.....	33
Domain 3.	Composition and Rhetoric	34
Domain 4.	Communications: Speech, Media, and Creative Performance	36

Part 3: Implementation of Program Quality Standards for Subject Matter Preparation

Program Equivalency	39
Review and Improvement of Subject Matter Standards	39
Adoption and Implementation of Standards by the Commission	40
Technical Assistance Meetings	40
Implementation Timeline: Impact on Candidates for Credentials	40
Implementation Plan Adopted by the Commission.....	41
Timeline for Implementing the English Standards.....	42
Implementation Timeline Diagram	43
Review and Approval of Subject Matter Programs.....	44
Selection, Composition and Training of Program Review Panels	44
Steps in the Review of Programs	45
Submission Guidelines for Single Subject Matter Program Documents	46
Transmittal Instructions	46
Submittal Deadlines.....	46
Transmittal Documents.....	47
Blended Programs	47
Responding to the Standards.....	47
Packaging a Submission for Shipment to the Commission	49
Submission Request Forms	50
Appendix A, Assembly Bill 537 (Education Code Chapter 587, Statutes of 1999).....	54

Part 1: Introduction to English Teaching Standards

Standards and Credentials for Teachers of English: A Foreword by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

One of the purposes of education is to enable students to learn the important subjects of the school curriculum to further their professional goals and to function effectively in work, society and family life. More than one million students in California enroll annually in English classes with teachers who are certified by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) to teach those classes in public schools. Students who are the future of California and the nation must learn to use English thoughtfully and skillfully. Their ability to do so depends substantially on the quality of teacher preparation in English and English teaching.

The Commission is the agency of California government that certifies the competence of teachers and other professionals who serve in the public schools. As the policy-making body that establishes and maintains standards for the education profession in the state, the Commission is concerned with the quality and effectiveness of the preparation of teachers and other school practitioners. On behalf of the education profession and the general public, one of the Commission's most important responsibilities is to establish and implement strong, effective standards of quality for the preparation and assessment of credential candidates.

California teacher candidates are required to demonstrate competence in the subject matter they will be authorized to teach. Candidates for the Single Subject Teaching Credential have two options available for satisfying this requirement. They can either complete a Commission-approved subject matter preparation program or they can pass the appropriate Commission-adopted subject matter examination(s) (Education Code Sections 44280 and 44310). Because they satisfy the same requirement, these two options are to be as aligned and congruent as possible.

The substance and relevance of the single subject matter program standards and the validity of examination specifications (subject matter requirements) is not permanent, however. The periodic reconsideration of subject matter program standards and the need for periodic validity studies are related directly to one of the Commission's fundamental missions to provide a strong assurance that teaching credentials issued by the Commission are awarded to individuals who have the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are needed in order to succeed in public school teaching positions in California. Best professional practice related to the program standards and the legal defensibility of the examination specifications require that the standards and specifications be periodically reviewed and rewritten, as job requirements and expectations change over time (Ed Code 44225i,j, 44257, 44288).

In the early 1990s, CCTC developed and adopted (a) standards for single subject matter preparation programs and, at the same time, (b) specifications for the single subject matter examinations. This work was based on the advice of subject matter advisory panels and data from validity studies and resulted in program standards and examination specifications (defining the subject matter competence requirement) that were valid and closely aligned with each other. Those standards and specifications were adopted by the Commission in 1992 and are still in use today. They are now

being replaced by the newly adopted (2002) subject matter requirements and single subject matter standards.

Establishing high standards for teachers is based, in part, on three major pieces of legislation. In 1988, 1992 and 1998 the Legislature and the governor enacted legislation sponsored by the Commission that strengthened the professional character of the Commission and enhanced its authority to establish rigorous standards for the preparation and assessment of prospective teachers. These reform laws were Senate Bills 148 (1988), 1422 (1992) Bergeson, and 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni, Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998). As a result, the Commission has taken on new responsibilities for establishing high and acceptable levels of quality in teacher preparation and of competence among beginning teachers. To implement these three statutes, CCTC has developed new standards, subject matter requirements and other policies collaboratively with representatives of post-secondary institutions, teachers and administrators in public schools, and statewide leaders involved in public education.

In the late 1990s, the State Board of Education adopted academic content standards for California K-12 students in English, mathematics, science, and social science. These new standards have direct implications for the subject matter competence requirement of prospective teachers. This was recognized in SB 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni, Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998), which requires the Commission to ensure that subject matter program standards and examinations are aligned with the K-12 student content standards adopted by the State Board of Education.

The Commission appointed four panels in 1999 (English, mathematics, science, and social science) to begin the first of three phases to meet the SB 2042 mandate for single subject matter programs. The second and third phases will bring all 13 subject matter areas for credentials into alignment with K-12 student content standards by 2005. The first phase single subject matter panels (2001, 2002) spent considerable time to ensure that the new subject matter standards were grounded in, and aligned with, the academic content standards for California K-12 students.

Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness

Over the past 15 years CCTC has thoroughly redesigned its policies regarding the preparation of education professionals and the review of preparation programs in colleges and universities. In initiating these reforms, the Commission adopted the following principles regarding the governance of educator preparation programs. The Commission asked the Single Subject Panels to apply these general principles to the creation of standards for subject matter programs in English, mathematics, science and social science.

- 1) The status of teacher preparation programs in colleges and universities should be determined on the basis of standards that relate to significant aspects of the quality of those programs.*
- 2) There are many ways in which a teacher preparation program could be excellent.*
- 3) The curriculum of teacher education plays a central role in a program's quality.*
- 4) Teacher education programs should prepare candidates to teach the public school curriculum effectively.*

- 5) *In California's public schools, the student population is so diverse that the preparation of educators to teach culturally diverse students cannot be the exclusive responsibility of professional preparation programs in schools of education.*
- 6) *The curriculum of a teacher education program should be based on an explicit statement of purpose and philosophy. An excellent program also includes student services and policies such as advisement services and admission policies.*
- 7) *The Commission is concerned about the high level of attrition among beginning teachers, and has successfully sponsored legislation to improve the conditions in which new teachers work.*
- 8) *The assessment of each student's attainments in a teacher education program is a significant responsibility of the institution that offers the program.*
- 9) *The Commission's standards of program quality allow quality to assume different forms in different environments.*
- 10) *The Commission's standards of program quality are roughly equivalent in breadth and importance.*
- 11) *Whether a particular program fulfills the Commission's standards is a judgment that is made by professionals who have been trained in interpreting the standards.*

The Commission fulfills one of its responsibilities to the public and the profession by adopting and implementing standards of program quality and effectiveness. While assuring the public that educator preparation is excellent, the Commission respects the considered judgments of educational institutions and professional educators and holds educators accountable for excellence. The premises and principles outlined above reflect the Commission's approach to fulfilling its responsibilities under the law.

Standards for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs

The effectiveness of the English curriculum in California schools does not depend entirely on the content knowledge of English teachers. Another critical factor is the teachers' ability to *teach* English language arts. To address the *pedagogical* knowledge and effectiveness of English teachers, the Commission in September 1998 launched an extensive standards and assessment reform that led to the development of new teacher preparation standards. In January 2001, CCTC authorized an extensive field review of the draft standards, and in July a summary and analysis of the field review findings were presented to the Commission. During July and August 2001, the standards were amended, based on field review findings and direction from the Commission, and finally adopted by the Commission in September 2001.

The advisory panel that developed the standards was charged with developing the following three policy documents for review and consideration by the Commission:

- New standards of quality and effectiveness for professional teacher preparation programs.
- Teaching Performance Expectations that would serve as the basis for evaluating the competence of teacher candidates on teaching performance assessments embedded in preparation programs.
- New standards of quality and effectiveness for professional teacher induction programs.

These standards implement the structural changes in the teacher credentialing system that were called for in Senate Bill 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni, Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998). Three significant changes enacted in this reform legislation are:

- alignment of all teacher preparation standards with the state-adopted academic content standards and performance levels for students and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP);
- inclusion of a teaching performance assessment in preparation programs; and
- a required induction period of support and formative assessment for all first and second year teachers.

In addition to these structural and thematic shifts in the Commission's credentialing system and standards, SB 2042 replaced the Professional Clear Credential course requirements in health, mainstreaming and technology with a requirement that essential preparation in these three areas be addressed in preparation and induction standards. Follow-up legislation in 1999, AB 1059 (Duchenev, Chapter 711, Statutes of 1999) required that new standards for preparation and induction programs include preparation for all teachers to teach English learners in mainstream classrooms. The subject matter standards in this handbook have been designed to complement the SB 2042 standards for programs of pedagogical preparation.

Subject Matter Preparation Programs for Prospective Teachers

In California, subject matter preparation programs for prospective teachers are not the same as undergraduate degree programs. Post-secondary institutions govern academic programs that lead to the award of degrees, including baccalaureate degrees in English. The Commission sets standards for academic programs that lead to the issuance of credentials, including the Single Subject Teaching Credential in English. An applicant for a teaching credential must have earned a Bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, but the degree may be in a subject other than the one to appear on the credential. Similarly, degree programs for undergraduate students in English may or may not fulfill the Commission's standards for subject matter preparation. Completing an approved subject matter program that satisfies the standards enables a candidate to qualify for the Single Subject Credential in English.

Subject Matter Advisory Panels

The California Commission On Teacher Credentialing asked the English Subject Matter Advisory Panel to create new standards of program quality and effectiveness that could be used to review and approve subject matter preparation programs. The Commission requested the development of standards that would emphasize the knowledge, skills and perspectives that teachers must have in order to teach English effectively in the public schools.

In January 2001 CCTC's executive director appointed subject matter panels in English, mathematics, science, and social science to advise Commission staff on the development of new subject matter program standards and examinations in these subject areas. Each panel consists of:

- Classroom teachers of the subject area,

- Subject area specialists in school districts, county offices of education, and postsecondary institutions,
- Professors in the subject area teaching in subject matter preparation programs,
- Teacher educators,
- Members of relevant professional organizations,
- Members of other relevant committees and advisory panels, and
- A liaison from the California Department of Education.

Eighteen panel members were appointed to the English panel; 17 members appointed to the mathematics panel; 20 appointed to the social science; and 23 appointed to the science panel. The panels began their work in March 2001 with a written “charge” describing their responsibilities in developing the Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs). The SMRs are the subject-specific knowledge, skills, and abilities, which specify the content required in Commission-approved subject matter preparation programs for teacher candidates. The SMRs were approved by the Commission at its June 6, 2002, meeting.

Essential Documents for Panel Use

From their first meeting in March 2001, the subject matter panels used a number of documents as primary resources for their work. The documents listed below were essential for the panels’ use in developing the draft program standards that were adopted by the Commission.

- The academic content standards for K-12 students and frameworks that have been approved by the California State Board of Education (1998-2002).
- The Commission-approved (1992) Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Subject Matter Programs in English, Mathematics, Science, and Social Science, and Handbooks for Teacher Educators and Program Reviewers in each of the four academic areas (1992).
- The Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Requirements for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential (Sept. 2001).
- The Standards for Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs (Sept. 2001).
- The National Standards for the National Council for Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE), National Council for Social Science (NCSS), and National Science Teachers Association (NSTA).
- The panels also reviewed several other publications and research articles. Several panel members brought state and national studies and publications for each panels’ use.

The State Board of Education adopted K-12 student academic content standards were the seminal documents used by the panels. In the 1992 documents the panels identified six standard areas that were common to each of the four sets of academic standards. This process was instrumental in

assisting the panels in identifying the 10 “Standards Common to All” that were developed and apply to all 13 single subject areas.

The Subject Matter Requirements for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential were also an important document used by the panel. In many cases the Multiple Subject Standards language and organization of the standards and standard elements were adopted by the panels. The standards of the national professional organizations also served as a guide and provided a comprehensive perspective for panel members.

The single subject matter standards were formatted and aligned with the SB 2042 standards. In the new format the standard is presented, followed by the identification of the required elements of the standard. All elements were written to articulate the language of the standard. This practice contrasts with the structure of the 1992 single subject standards, where a “rationale” was provided for each standard that, at times, went beyond the language of the standard itself. The 1992 standards contained “factors to consider” that, in certain instances, also went beyond the language of the standard.

Field Review Survey

Early in August 2002 the draft Single Subject Matter Standards and the 10 “Standards Common to All” were mailed to all deans of education, directors of teacher education, and single subject coordinators at all Commission-accredited four-year institutions in California, learned societies and professional organizations, funded subject matter projects, teacher organizations, school districts, and county offices of education. Over 100 selected K-12 public school teachers and college/university professors were sent the draft standards. The standards were also placed on the Commission’s web site with instructions on how to download the standards and complete the field review survey and how to fax, email, or mail completed surveys to the Commission.

There were 717 responses submitted to the Commission in October 2002. Over 80% of all responses fell in the “Essential” or “Important” categories. Fewer than 5% of all responses were scored as “Not Important” and less than 15% were scored as “Somewhat Important.” The responses were evenly distributed among the five sets of standards.

Over 80% of all responses were from higher education faculty at colleges and universities in California. Over 70% of responses were received from academic departments or faculty in the California State University (CSU) system. Responses were received from all 23 CSU campuses, five University of California campuses, and 14 private or independent institutions. The CSU Academic Senate was instrumental in obtaining strong responses from academic departments in the CSU system.

Consultant staff tallied all responses and listed all comments on a master survey form for each subject matter area. The Single Subject Matter Panels made revisions in the language of certain standards, based on the 2002 field review, and the revised standards were recommended to CCTC for adoption at its meeting on December 5, 2002. The Commission also approved eight technical assistance meetings for spring 2003 and an implementation plan for the new standards.

The English Teaching Credential

The Single Subject Teaching Credential in English authorizes an individual to teach English classes in departmentalized settings. The holders of this credential may teach at any grade level, but the great majority of English classes occur in grades seven through twelve. The Commission asked the English Teacher Preparation and Assessment Advisory Panel to recommend new policies to ensure that future teachers of English are prepared to instruct the subjects that are most commonly taught in English classes. In 2001-02 when the advisory panel was established, approximately half of all English classes in California public schools were comprehensive courses in language, composition and literature for students in grades seven through twelve. The other classes taught by English teachers in 2000-01 were more specialized courses in:

Reading Improvement	11% of All English Classes
English as a Second Language	7%
Journalism, Speech and Other Subjects	11%
American, English and World Literature	11%
Drama, Theater and Television	4%
Composition	2%

The requirements and other policies in this document are designed to prepare teachers for comprehensive classes in language, composition and literature, as well as the more specialized courses listed above.

Alignment of Program Standards and Performance Assessments

The Teacher Preparation and Licensing Act of 1970 (Ryan Act) established the requirement that candidates for teaching credentials verify their knowledge of the subjects they intend to teach. Candidates for teaching credentials may satisfy the subject matter requirement by completing approved subject matter programs or passing subject matter examinations that have been adopted by the Commission. In 1998 Senate Bill 2042 required that subject matter programs and examinations for prospective teachers be aligned with K-12 student standards and frameworks.

To achieve this alignment and congruence in English, the Commission asked the English Subject Matter Advisory Panel to develop subject matter requirements that would be consistent in scope and content with the K-12 standards and frameworks. Following extensive research and review, the Commission adopted a detailed set of *Subject Matter Requirements for Prospective Teachers of English*, which follow the standards in this handbook. College and university faculty and administrators are urged to examine these requirements as a source of information about content that is essential to include in subject matter preparation programs.

The Commission sought to align the subject matter requirements with the program standards in each subject area. Each subject matter advisory panel is asked to develop standards and subject matter requirements that are as congruent with each other as possible, to maximize the equivalence between credentials that are earned by completing programs and ones that are earned by passing examinations. Standards and examinations were developed from the same set of subject matter requirements.

New Subject Matter Assessments

The Commission has used a variety of assessments to satisfy the examination option for various subject areas. In the early 1990s, the Commission developed and adopted (a) standards for subject matter preparation programs and, at the same time, (b) specifications for the subject matter examinations. The validity of the subject matter competence requirement (i.e., program standards and examination specifications) is not permanent, however. The need for periodic validity studies of the subject matter requirement is directly related to one of the Commission's most fundamental missions: to provide a strong assurance that teaching credentials are awarded to individuals who have learned the most important knowledge, skills, and abilities that are actually needed in order to succeed in California public school teaching positions.

In the late 1990s, the State Board of Education adopted K-12 student content standards in English, mathematics, science, and social science. Beginning in early 2001, the Commission began the process of developing assessments that were aligned with these new standards. In the spring of 2002, the Commission contracted with National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES®) to implement a new examination program called the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET). In the four subject areas, multiple-choice and constructed-response items were drafted based on the subject matter requirements, and reviewed and revised as needed by both the Bias Review Committee and the appropriate subject matter advisory panel.

The CSET for English, mathematics, science, and social science were first administered in January 2003, and by June 2003, fully replaced the SSAT and Praxis II examinations as the new subject matter examinations in these areas. From January through June 2003, teacher candidates in these subject areas were allowed to use either the new CSET or the combination of appropriate SSAT and Praxis II examinations.

Overview of the English Standards Handbook

This introduction to the handbook concludes with a statement by the English Advisory Panel regarding English teaching and teacher preparation in California. Part 2 of the handbook includes the sixteen standards as well as the Subject Matter Requirements for Prospective Teachers of English. Part 3 provides information about implementation of the new standards in California colleges and universities.

Contributions of the English Advisory Panel

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is indebted to the English Teacher Subject Matter Advisory Panel for the successful creation of *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Subject Matter Preparation of Prospective Teachers of English*. CCTC believes strongly that the standards in this handbook will improve the teaching and learning of English language arts in California's public schools.

Request for Assistance from Handbook Users

The Commission periodically reviews its policies, in part on the basis of responses from colleges, universities, school districts, county offices, professional organizations and individual professionals.

The Commission welcomes all comments and questions about the standards and other policies in this handbook, which should be addressed to:

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Professional Services Division
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213

English Teaching and Teacher Preparation: An Introduction by the English Advisory Panel

A successful subject matter preparation program in English provides comprehensive preparation in the discipline of English. Through the focused study of literature, composition, language, media and creative performance, students discover the power of language to articulate the best of human thought and to affect the course of human action. As a result of this course of study, prospective teachers will be prepared to teach a curriculum that includes the full range of skills and knowledge found in the California Reading/Language Arts Framework.

Literature and Textual Analysis: Literature reflects the most eloquent statements about the human condition, and becomes the central core of study in the preparation of English teachers. The program curriculum will honor both traditional and emerging definitions of literature for the most comprehensive relevant representation of an evolving canon. It will include a broadened definition of the content, types and periods of literature, theories of textual analysis and types of discourse. Recognizing changes in the nature of text, modern literary studies also include non-print and non-linear media forms of communication. Through the study of oral and written expression, and of the nature of language itself, students in the English preparation program are intellectually challenged by the body of knowledge and modes of inquiry that are specific to the discipline. They are also motivated to communicate an enthusiasm for literature and language to younger learners.

Language, Linguistics and Literacy: Essential to the study of English is a knowledge of language structures, linguistics, and language acquisition. The study of linguistics provides necessary in-depth knowledge of the history, complexity, and power of language. Since today's prospective teachers must be prepared to teach students from diverse linguistic backgrounds, traditional studies of language and linguistics must be expanded to include the study of language acquisition and development, as well as the acquisition and uses of literacy.

Composition and Rhetoric: The study of composition and rhetoric should reflect the current best practices in composition studies. These should include an understanding of composing processes as well as structures of texts, rhetorical effects of grammatical choices, and conventions of usage and mechanics. Prospective teachers of writing should be able to construct coherent effective texts for a variety of purposes in a variety of contexts, including the preparation of oral or media presentations and the conducting of academic research.

Communications: Speech, Media, and Creative Performance: Well-prepared students of English understand the critical role the art of communication plays in our complex world today. Instruction in this area develops competencies in the study and practice of effective communication. The program will include instruction in oral communication processes, media analysis and journalistic applications, dramatic performance, and creative writing. Prospective teachers will have opportunities to obtain knowledge and experience in the practice of creative expression.

Together the four domains provide comprehensive preparation for the authorized areas of the English credential. An approved teacher preparation program may either maintain established traditional divisions of course work or seek an innovative integration of these areas of study. Because all four domains are addressed in the English/Language Arts classrooms, it is also paramount that English education programs encourage students to recognize the interconnections among those domains.

The planning of effective subject matter preparation is no small task, but neither is the teaching of English in today's public schools. The challenges and the rewards are many because the contribution of the English/language arts curriculum to the school program and to society at large is so great.

The power of the discipline of English lies in its capacity to open doors for all students. The study of English provides them with the skills of listening and speaking, reading, writing, and thinking that enable them to succeed in all their academic studies, whether science or mathematics or social studies or other languages or the arts. It empowers them to communicate effectively in the workplace or the marketplace, to participate fully in the democracy or interpersonal relationships, to understand that using language effectively enables them to persuade or influence others or to function successfully in an era of technology and information. The study of English motivates students to reflect on the connection between their own experience and the human condition; to appreciate the diverse cultures in our literary heritage and society at large; and to understand the ways that language articulates moral and ethical values, delights the spirit, or expresses the creative impulses of human thought.

The significant challenge to subject matter preparation programs in English lies in preparing candidates to enter credential programs and teaching careers with excitement about the potential for accomplishing those ends by teaching and learning English through the study of literature, composition, and language and linguistics, and communications.

Part 2: Standards of Program Quality in English

Definitions of Key Terms

California state law authorizes the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to set standards and requirements for preparation programs (Ed Code 44225a, i, j, 44310, 44311).

Precondition

A precondition is a requirement for initial and continued program approval. Unlike standards, preconditions specify requirements for program compliance, not program quality. The Commission determines whether a program complies with the adopted preconditions on the basis of a program document provided by the college or university. In the program review sequence, a program that meets all preconditions is eligible for a more intensive review to determine if the program's quality satisfies the Commission's standards. Preconditions for the approval of subject matter programs in English are on following pages.

Standards

Standards are state policies adopted by the California Commission On Teacher Credentialing to describe acceptable levels of quality in programs of subject matter study that are offered by regionally-accredited colleges and universities that award baccalaureate degrees. Each standard is elaborated by Required Elements for that standard. Program reviewers selected by the Commission must find that a program meets each standard. When they do so, CCTC approves the program.

Standards are statements of program quality that must be fulfilled for initial or continued approval of a subject matter program by the Commission. In each standard, the Commission has described an acceptable level of quality in a significant aspect of English teacher preparation. The Commission determines whether a program satisfies a standard on the basis of an intensive review of all available information related to the standard.

Required Elements

Required Elements guide institutions in developing programs that meet the standards and program review panels in judging the quality of a program in relation to a standard. Within the scope of a standard, each element describes how an area of the subject matter requirements should be applied in a program. The elements identify the dimensions of program quality that the CCTC considers important. Required Elements are descriptive statements that elaborate and clarify the meaning of a major provision of a standard of program quality. In determining whether a program fulfills a given standard, the Commission expects the review panel to consider all of the required elements in conjunction with each other. Program reviewers selected by the Commission must find that a program meets each required element. When they do, the CCTC approves the program.

Preconditions for the Approval of Subject Matter Programs in English

To be approved by the Commission, a Subject Matter Program in English must comply with the following preconditions.

- (1) Each Program of Subject Matter Preparation for the Single Subject Teaching Credential in English shall include (a) a minimum of 36 semester units (or 54 quarter units) of core coursework in English and related subjects that are commonly taught in departmentalized classes in California public schools, and (b) a minimum of 12 semester units (or 18 quarter units) of coursework that provides extended study of the subject. These two requirements are elaborated in Preconditions 2 and 3.
- (2) The core (breadth) of the program shall include coursework in (or directly related to) the following subjects that are commonly taught in departmentalized classes of English and related subjects in the public schools, including:
 - Literature and Textual Analysis;
 - Language, Linguistics, and Literacy;
 - Composition and Rhetoric; and
 - Communications: Speech, Media, and Creative Performance.
- (3) Extended studies in the program (breadth, depth, perspective, concentrations) designed to supplement the core of the program may be offered in any or all of the following patterns:
 - A combination of related content areas within or across domains
 - A concentration in one domain
 - A concentration in any content area within a domain

In addition to describing how a program meets each standard of program quality in this handbook, the program document by an institution shall include the course titles, unit designations, catalog descriptions and syllabi of all courses in the program that are used to meet the standards. Program documents must include a matrix chart that identifies which courses meet which standards.

Institutions may determine whether the standards and required elements are addressed through one or more courses for each commonly taught subject or courses offering integrated study of these subjects. Institutions may also define the program in terms of required or elective coursework. However, elective options must be equivalent in meeting the standards. Coursework offered by any appropriate department(s) of a regionally accredited institution may satisfy the preconditions and standards in this handbook. Programs may use general education courses in meeting the standards.

Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness

Category I: Standards Common to All Single Subject Matter Preparation Programs

Standard 1: Program Philosophy and Purpose

The subject matter preparation program is based on an explicit statement of program philosophy that expresses its purpose, design, and desired outcomes in relation to the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs. The program provides the coursework and field experiences necessary to teach the specified subject to all of California's diverse public school population. Subject matter preparation in the program for prospective teachers is academically rigorous and intellectually stimulating. The program curriculum reflects and builds on the State-adopted *Content Standards for California Public Schools K-12* and curriculum frameworks for California public schools. The program is designed to establish a strong foundation in and understanding of subject matter knowledge for prospective teachers that provides a basis for continued development during each teacher's professional career. The sponsoring institution assigns high priority to and appropriately supports the program as an essential part of its mission.

Required Elements:

- 1.1 The program philosophy, design, and intended outcomes are consistent with the content of the State-adopted academic content standards for K-12 students and curriculum frameworks for California public schools.
- 1.2 The statement of program philosophy shows a clear understanding of the preparation that prospective teachers need in order to be effective in delivering academic content to all students in California schools.
- 1.3 The program provides prospective teachers with the opportunity to learn and apply significant ideas, structures, methods and core concepts in the specified subject discipline(s) that underlies the 6-12 curriculum.
- 1.4 The program prepares prospective single-subject teachers to analyze complex discipline-based issues; synthesize information from multiple sources and perspectives; communicate skillfully in oral and written forms; and use appropriate technologies.
- 1.5 Program outcomes are defined clearly and assessments of prospective teachers and program reviews are appropriately aligned.
- 1.6 The institution conducts periodic review of the program philosophy, goals, design, and outcomes consistent with the following: campus program assessment timelines, procedures, and policies; ongoing research and thinking in the discipline; nationally accepted content standards and recommendations; and the changing needs of public schools in California.

Standard 2: Diversity and Equity

The subject matter program provides equitable opportunities to learn for all prospective teachers by utilizing instructional, advisement and curricular practices that insure equal access to program academic content and knowledge of career options. Included in the program are the essential understandings, knowledge and appreciation of the perspectives and contributions by and about diverse groups in the discipline.

Required Elements:

- 2.1 In accordance with the Education Code Chapter 587, Statutes of 1999, (See Appendix A), human differences and similarities to be examined in the program include, but are not limited to those of sex, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, religion, sexual orientation, and exceptionality. The program may also include study of other human similarities and differences.
- 2.2 The institution recruits and provides information and advice to men and women prospective teachers from diverse backgrounds on requirements for admission to and completion of subject matter programs.
- 2.3 The curriculum in the Subject Matter Program reflects the perspectives and contributions of diverse groups from a variety of cultures to the disciplines of study.
- 2.4 In the subject matter program, classroom practices and instructional materials are designed to provide equitable access to the academic content of the program to prospective teachers from all backgrounds.
- 2.5 The subject matter program incorporates a wide variety of pedagogical and instructional approaches to academic learning suitable to a diverse population of prospective teachers. Instructional practices and materials used in the program support equitable access for all prospective teachers and take into account current knowledge of cognition and human learning theory.

Standard 3: Technology

The study and application of current and emerging technologies, with a focus on those used in K-12 schools, for gathering, analyzing, managing, processing, and presenting information is an integral component of each prospective teacher's program study. Prospective teachers are introduced to legal, ethical, and social issues related to technology. The program prepares prospective teachers to meet the current technology requirements for admission to an approved California professional teacher preparation program.

Required Elements:

- 3.1 The institution provides prospective teachers in the subject matter program access to a wide array of current technology resources. The program faculty selects these technologies on the basis of their effective and appropriate uses in the disciplines of the subject matter program.
- 3.2 Prospective teachers demonstrate information processing competency, including but not limited to the use of appropriate technologies and tools for research, problem solving, data acquisition and analysis, communications, and presentation.
- 3.3 In the program, prospective teachers use current and emerging technologies relevant to the disciplines of study to enhance their subject matter knowledge and understanding.

Standard 4: Literacy

The program of subject matter preparation for prospective Single Subject teachers develops skills in literacy and academic discourse in the academic disciplines of study. Coursework and field experiences in the program include reflective and analytic instructional activities that specifically address the use of language, content and discourse to extend meaning and knowledge about ideas and experiences in the fields or discipline of the subject matter.

Required Elements:

- 4.1 The program develops prospective teachers' abilities to use academic language, content, and disciplinary thinking in purposeful ways to analyze, synthesize and evaluate experiences and enhance understanding in the discipline.
- 4.2 The program prepares prospective teachers to understand and use appropriately academic and technical terminology and the research conventions of the disciplines of the subject matter.
- 4.3 The program provides prospective teachers with opportunities to learn and demonstrate competence in reading, writing, listening, speaking, communicating and reasoning in their fields or discipline of the subject matter.

Standard 5: Varied Teaching Strategies

In the program, prospective Single Subject teachers participate in a variety of learning experiences that model effective curriculum practices, instructional strategies and assessments that prospective teachers will be expected to use in their own classrooms.

Required Elements:

- 5.1 Program faculty include in their instruction a variety of curriculum design, classroom organizational strategies, activities, materials and field experiences incorporating observing, recording, analyzing and interpreting content as appropriate to the discipline.
- 5.2 Program faculty employ a variety of interactive, engaging teaching styles that develop and reinforce skills and concepts through open-ended activities such as direct instruction, discourse, demonstrations, individual and cooperative learning explorations, peer instruction and student-centered discussion.
- 5.3 Faculty development programs provide tangible support for subject matter faculty to explore and use exemplary and innovative curriculum practices.
- 5.4 Program faculty use varied and innovative teaching strategies, which provide opportunities for prospective teachers to learn how content is conceived and organized for instruction in a way that fosters conceptual understanding as well as procedural knowledge.
- 5.5 Program coursework and fieldwork include the examination and use of various kinds of technology that are appropriate to the subject matter discipline.

Standard 6: Early Field Experiences

The program provides prospective Single Subject teachers with planned, structured field experiences in departmentalized classrooms beginning as early as possible in the subject matter program. These classroom experiences are linked to program coursework and give a breadth of experiences across grade levels and with diverse populations. The early field experience program is planned collaboratively by subject matter faculty, teacher education faculty and representatives from school districts. The institution cooperates with school districts in selecting schools and classrooms for introductory classroom experiences. The program includes a clear process for documenting each prospective teacher's observations and experiences.

Required Elements:

- 6.1 Introductory experiences shall include one or more of the following activities: planned observations, instruction or tutoring experiences, and other school based observations or activities that are appropriate for undergraduate students in a subject matter preparation program.
- 6.2 Prospective teachers' early field experiences are substantively linked to the content of coursework in the program.
- 6.3 Fieldwork experiences for all prospective teachers include significant interactions with K-12 students from diverse populations represented in California public schools and cooperation with at least one carefully selected teacher certificated in the discipline of study.
- 6.4 Prospective teachers will have opportunities to reflect on and analyze their early field experiences in relation to course content. These opportunities may include field experience journals, portfolios, and discussions in the subject matter courses, among others.
- 6.5 Each prospective teacher is primarily responsible for documenting early field experiences. Documentation is reviewed as part of the program requirements.

Standard 7: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence

The program uses formative and summative multiple measures to assess the subject matter competence of each candidate. The scope and content of each candidate's assessment is consistent with the content of the subject matter requirements of the program and with institutional standards for program completion.

Required Elements:

- 7.1 Assessment within the program includes multiple measures such as student performances, presentations, research projects, portfolios, field experience journals, observations, and interviews as well as oral and written examinations based on criteria established by the institution.
- 7.2 The scope and content of each assessment is congruent with the specifications for the subject matter knowledge and competence as indicated in the content domains of the Commission-adopted subject matter requirement.
- 7.3 End-of-program summative assessment of subject matter competence includes a defined process that incorporates multiple measures for evaluation of performance.
- 7.4 Assessment scope, process, and criteria are clearly delineated and made available to students when they begin the program.
- 7.5 Program faculty regularly evaluate the quality, fairness, and effectiveness of the assessment process, including its consistency with program requirements.
- 7.6 The institution that sponsors the program determines, establishes and implements a standard of minimum scholarship (such as overall GPA, minimum course grade or other assessments) of program completion for prospective single subject teachers.

Standard 8: Advisement and Support

The subject matter program includes a system for identifying, advising and retaining prospective Single Subject teachers. This system will comprehensively address the distinct needs and interests of a range of prospective teachers, including resident prospective students, early deciders entering blended programs, groups underrepresented among current teachers, prospective teachers who transfer to the institution, and prospective teachers in career transition.

Required Elements:

- 8.1 The institution will develop and implement processes for identifying prospective Single Subject teachers and advising them about all program requirements and career options.
- 8.2 Advisement services will provide prospective teachers with information about their academic progress, including transfer agreements and alternative paths to a teaching credential, and describe the specific qualifications needed for each type of credential, including the teaching assignments it authorizes.
- 8.3 The subject matter program facilitates the transfer of prospective teachers between post-secondary institutions, including community colleges, through effective outreach and advising and the articulation of courses and requirements. The program sponsor works cooperatively with community colleges to ensure that subject matter coursework at feeder campuses is aligned with the relevant portions of the state-adopted academic *Content Standards for California Public Schools K-12*.
- 8.4 The institution establishes clear and reasonable criteria and allocates sufficient time and personnel resources to enable qualified personnel to evaluate prospective teachers' previous coursework and/or fieldwork for meeting subject matter requirements.

Standard 9: Program Review and Evaluation

The institution implements a comprehensive, ongoing system for periodic review of and improvement to the subject matter program. The ongoing system of review and improvement involves university faculty, community college faculty, student candidates and appropriate public schools personnel involved in beginning teacher preparation and induction. Periodic reviews shall be conducted at intervals not exceeding 5 years.

Required Elements:

- 9.1 Each periodic review includes an examination of program goals, design, curriculum, requirements, student success, technology uses, advising services, assessment procedures and program outcomes for prospective teachers.
- 9.2 Each program review examines the quality and effectiveness of collaborative partnerships with secondary schools and community colleges.
- 9.3 The program uses appropriate methods to collect data to assess the subject matter program's strengths, weaknesses and areas that need improvement. Participants in the review include faculty members, current students, recent graduates, education faculty, employers, and appropriate community college and public school personnel.
- 9.4 Program improvements are based on the results of periodic reviews, the inclusion and implications of new knowledge about the subject(s) of study, the identified needs of program students and school districts in the region, and curriculum policies of the State of California.

Standard 10: Coordination

One or more faculty responsible for program planning, implementation and review coordinate the Single Subject Matter Preparation Program. The program sponsor allocates resources to support effective coordination and implementation of all aspects of the program. The coordinator(s) fosters and facilitates ongoing collaboration among academic program faculty, local school personnel, local community colleges and the professional education faculty.

Required Elements:

- 10.1 A program coordinator will be designated from among the academic program faculty.
- 10.2 The program coordinator provides opportunities for collaboration by faculty, students, and appropriate public school personnel in the design and development of and revisions to the program, and communicates program goals to the campus community, other academic partners, school districts and the public.
- 10.3 The institution allocates sufficient time and resources for faculty coordination and staff support for development, implementation and revision of all aspects of the program.
- 10.4 The program provides opportunities for collaboration on curriculum development among program faculty.
- 10.5 University and program faculty cooperate with community colleges to coordinate courses and articulate course requirements for prospective teachers to facilitate transfer to a baccalaureate degree-granting institution.

Category II: Program Standards for English

Standard 11: Required Subject of Study

The subject matter preparation program is based on an explicit statement of program philosophy that expresses its purpose, design, and desired outcomes reflective of the Standards for Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs. The program provides the course work and field experiences necessary to teach the specified subject to all students in California's diverse public school population. The subject matter preparation for prospective teachers is academically rigorous and intellectually stimulating. The institution assigns high priority to and appropriately supports the program as an essential part of its mission. The program curriculum reflects and builds on the State-adopted English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1997) and Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999). The program is designed to establish a strong foundation in subject matter knowledge and understanding that provides a basis for continued development during the teachers' professional career.

Required Elements:

- 11.1 The core program provides broad foundational studies in the four English domains as detailed in Standards 13 through 16 (literature and textual analysis; language, linguistics and literacy; composition and rhetoric; communications, speech, media and creative performance).
- 11.2 The core program includes focused, in-depth study in one or more domains to provide rigorous, scholarly work in the recognized disciplines of English Language Arts.
- 11.3 The core program introduces English candidates to current and emerging issues in literacy, language acquisition and multicultural studies.
- 11.4 The core program includes the study of canonical literature as well as the literature of diversity, world literature, non-literary readings, workplace communications, and visual technologically mediated texts.
- 11.5 The core program includes study of research conducted and presented in multiple genres and media reflective of current technology in usage.
- 11.6 Throughout the program, literary works and other forms of human communication are considered in their historical and political contexts.

Standard 12: Extended Studies

The program includes coursework to supplement the program core and further prepare prospective teachers in the range of subjects included in the state-adopted Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999). Prospective teachers build upon foundational knowledge acquired in the program core by further work within or across content domains. The program's design for extended studies provides prospective teachers with options, including both specialized and comprehensive preparation based on coherent patterns of coursework.

Required Elements:

- 12.1 The program offers extended studies that ensure that prospective teachers deepen their knowledge within or across content domains.
- 12.2 Extended study may be offered in any or all of the following patterns:
 - a. A combination of related content areas across one or more of the four domains: literature and textual analysis; language and linguistics; composition and rhetoric; and communications: speech, media and creative performance
 - b. Concentration in one domain
 - c. Concentration in any content area within a domain (e.g., speech, multicultural literature, theater)
- 12.3 The program provides advising for prospective teachers to select or develop a coherent pattern of extended study based on a well-defined goal (i.e., to meet requirements of the major; to complement or supplement studies in the program core; to pursue special professional interests, e.g. drama, journalism, and media).

Standard 13: Literature and Textual Analysis

Prospective teachers of English learners are prepared to recognize the power and importance of literature as it reflects the most eloquent statements about the human condition. Prospective teachers of English develop an appreciation for our diverse literary heritage as an expression of our poly-cultural society and understand the ways that language can be used to articulate moral and ethical values, delight the spirit, or express the creative impulses of human thought. The program curriculum includes traditional and emerging definitions of literature, types and periods of literature, and textual analysis.

Required Elements:

Prospective teachers in the program will:

- 13.1 Read, study and analyze works of literature from the canon, including the literature of diversity, from a variety of literary traditions, movements and historical contexts.
- 13.2 Know and analyze a variety of literary elements, their forms and uses.
- 13.3 Analyze literary and non-literary texts and understand their structure, content and interpretations.
- 13.4 Consider and articulate the ways in which literature can engage readers and cause them to reflect on their own experiences and the human condition.
- 13.5 Reflect on the ways literature can inspire personal and social growth and change.

Standard 14: Language, Linguistics and Literacy

The program requires prospective teachers of English to develop an understanding of language structures, language acquisition, linguistic diversity and the development of literacy. Prospective teachers know, understand and appreciate the varieties of spoken and written English and how they are related to the diverse cultures and societies where English is a medium of communication. Recognizing the needs of both native and non-native speakers, the program effectively models English as a communicative tool.

Required Elements:

Prospective teachers in the program will:

- 14.1 Know the conventions, forms and functions of Standard English grammar and sentence structure.
- 14.2 Recognize the universality of linguistic structures while acknowledging variation arising from differences of time, place and community.
- 14.3 Learn basic principles of morphology, phonology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics.
- 14.4 Explain cognitive, affective and socio-cultural as well as first language influences on language acquisition and development, and the role of these influences in developing academic literacy.
- 14.5 Examine and explain strategies for constructing meaning within the processes of reading and writing.

Standard 15: Composition and Rhetoric

In the program prospective teachers learn and apply a variety of composing processes. Prospective teachers of English analyze and compose texts representing a variety of discourse types and demonstrate the ability to use research strategies, text production technologies and presentation methods appropriately in a range of rhetorical contexts.

Required Elements:

Prospective teachers in the program will:

- 15.1 Read and study the rhetorical features of literary and non-literary texts, both fiction and non-fiction.
- 15.2 Analyze rhetorical and structural differences between oral written language to explain relations between speaking and writing. Study and apply aspects of oral and written composing processes.
- 15.3 Use and analyze grammatical elements of oral and written English for a variety of rhetorical effects.
- 15.4 Consistently and accurately apply the conventions of oral and written English.
- 15.5 Learn and apply advanced research strategies for academic work in English, including collection, integration and citation of data.

Standard 16: Communications: Speech, Media and Creative Performance

In the program prospective teachers of English acquire the breadth of knowledge needed to integrate journalism, technological media, speech, dramatic performance and creative writing into the language arts curriculum. Prospective teachers gain experience with oral and visual communication as expressed through media and performance as well as creative writing forms to understand how to use language effectively to communicate ideas and express themselves creatively.

Required Elements:

Prospective teachers in the program will:

- 16.1 Demonstrate and evaluate oral performance in a variety of forms, using appropriate delivery criteria.
- 16.2 Demonstrate the ability to analyze and respond to components of communication discourse such as audience feedback, supportive listening and critical thinking.
- 16.3 Learn and apply strategies used by the media to impact society and evaluate the impact.
- 16.4 Specify the processes and techniques for making presentations in a variety of media forms.
- 16.5 Participate in dramatic performance, such as traditional playscripts, reader's theater and oral interpretation.
- 16.6 Engage in theatrical processes, which apply production techniques, such as rehearsal strategies, principles of theatrical design and textual interpretation.
- 16.7 Produce creative writing in a variety of genres using processes and techniques that enhance the text.

Subject Matter Requirements For Prospective English Teachers

Content Domains for Subject Matter Understanding and Skill in English

More than ever before, teachers of English in California's middle and high schools must deliver a complex and dynamic curriculum to students of every socioeconomic, linguistic and cultural background. Furthermore, society is increasingly technologically and media oriented. The Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999) forms the basis for the preparation of English teachers, who must equip their students to meet the challenges of this changing world. In this context, new paradigms and models are required for teaching English/Language Arts. Multiple forms of literacy demand a broad theoretical knowledge of language and literacy acquisition, while new information technologies require an emphasis on critical analysis of both print and non-print texts.

Candidates for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English have a broad knowledge of literature, language and linguistics, rhetoric and composition, and communication studies. Candidates must be able to read and write well for a variety of purposes and communicate effectively within a variety of rhetorical contexts. In addition, candidates must have experience in theater arts, public speaking, journalism, textual analysis of nonfiction and electronic media, and production of technologically enhanced documents. This broad scope of background and skills ensures a greater degree of success in English/Language Arts classrooms for California's public school children.

Domain 1. Literature and Textual Analysis

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations and contexts of the literature and textual analysis contained in the English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1997) as outlined in the Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999) at a post secondary level of rigor. Candidates have both broad and deep conceptual knowledge of the subject matter. The candidate's preparation should include breadth of knowledge in literature, literary analysis and criticism, as well as non-literary text analysis. Literary analysis presumes in-depth exploration of the relationship between form and content. The curriculum should embrace representative selections from different literary traditions and major works from diverse cultures. Advanced study of multicultural writers is also fundamental preparation for teaching these works. Shakespeare remains integral to the secondary school curriculum; advanced study of his work is, therefore, essential to future secondary teachers. Candidates must be enthusiastic readers and writers, who know and apply effective reading strategies and compose thoughtful, well-crafted responses to literary and non-literary texts. Candidates will be able to:

1.1 Literary Analysis

- a. Recognize, compare, and evaluate different literary traditions to include:
 - American (inclusive of cultural pluralism)
 - British (inclusive of cultural pluralism)
 - World literature and literature in translation (inclusive of cross-cultural literature)

- Mythology and oral tradition
- b. Trace development of major literary movements in historical periods (e.g., Homeric Greece, medieval, neoclassic, romantic, modern)
- c. Describe the salient features of adolescent/Young Adult literature
- d. Analyze and interpret major works by representative writers in historical, aesthetic, political, and philosophical contexts

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 2.4; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.2, 3.5-7)

1.2 Literary Elements

- a. Distinguish salient features of genres (e.g., short stories, non-fiction, drama, poetry, and novel)
- b. Define and analyze basic elements of literature (e.g., plot, setting, character, point of view, theme, narrative structure, figurative language, tone, diction, and style)
- c. Articulate the relationship between the expressed purposes and the characteristics of different forms of dramatic literature (e.g., comedy, tragedy, drama, and dramatic monologue)
- d. Develop critical thinking and analytic skill through close reading of texts

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 1.1-2, 2.1, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8, 3.0; Grade 7, Reading: 1.1, 2.4, 3.1-5; Grade 8, Reading: 1.1, 2.7, 3.0; Grades 9-10, Reading: 1.1, 2.8, 3.1-4, 3.7-10; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.2, 3.1-4)

1.3 Literary Criticism

- a. Research and apply criticism of major texts and authors using print and/or electronic resources
- b. Research and apply various approaches to interpreting literature (e.g., aesthetic, historical, political, philosophical)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 2.1-2, 2.6-8, 3.6; Grade 7, Reading: 2.1, 2.4, 2.6, 3.0; Grade 8, Reading: 2.2, 2.6, 3.0; Grades 9-10, Reading: 2.2, 2.4, 2.8, 3.5-7, 3.11-12, Writing 1.6-7; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.2, 2.4, 3.8-9, Writing 1.6-7)

1.4 Analysis of Non-Literary Texts

- a. Compare various features of print and visual media (e.g., film, television, Internet)
- b. Evaluate structure and content of a variety of consumer, workplace, and public documents
- c. Interpret individual works in their cultural, social, and political contexts

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 2.0, 3.0; Grade 7, Reading: 2.1-5, 2.2, 3.0; Grade 8, Reading: 2.1-7, 3.0; Grades 9-10, Reading: 2.1, 2.2, 2.4-7, 3.0; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.1-3, 2.6, 3.0)

Domain 2. Language, Linguistics, and Literacy

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations and contexts of the language, linguistics, and literacy contained in the English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1997) as outlined in the Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999) at a post secondary level of rigor. Candidates have both broad and deep conceptual knowledge of the subject matter. Many California students, coming from a variety of linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds, face specific challenges in mastering the English language. The diversity of this population requires the candidate to understand the principles of language acquisition and development. Candidates must become knowledgeable about the nature of human language, language variation, and historical and cultural perspectives on the development of English. In addition, candidates must acquire a complex understanding of the development of English literacy among both native and non-native speakers. Candidates will be able to:

2.1 Human Language Structures

- a. Recognize the nature of human language, differences among languages, the universality of linguistic structures, and change across time, locale, and communities
- b. Demonstrate knowledge of word analysis, including sound patterns (phonology) and inflection, derivation, compounding, roots and affixes (morphology)
- c. Demonstrate knowledge of sentence structures (syntax), word and sentence meanings (semantics), and language function in communicative context (pragmatics)
- d. Use appropriate print and electronic sources to research etymologies; recognize conventions of English orthography and changes in word meaning and pronunciation

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 1.1-5; Grades 7-8, Reading: 1.2; Grades 9-10, Reading: 1.1-3)

2.2 Acquisition and Development of Language and Literacy

- a. Explain the influences of cognitive, affective, and sociocultural factors on language acquisition and development
- b. Explain the influence of a first language on second language development
- c. Describe methods and techniques for developing academic literacy (e.g., tapping prior knowledge through semantic mapping, word analogies, and cohesion analysis)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grades 6-12, Reading: 1.0)

2.3 Literacy Studies

- a. Recognize the written and oral conventions of Standard English, and analyze the social implications of mastering them
- b. Describe and explain cognitive elements of reading and writing processes (e.g., decoding and encoding, construction of meaning, recognizing and using text conventions of different genres)
- c. Explain metacognitive strategies for making sense of text (e.g., pre-reading activities, predicting, questioning, word analysis, and concept formation)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grades 6-12, Reading: 1.0)

2.4 Grammatical Structures of English

- a. Identify methods of sentence construction (e.g., sentence combining with coordinators and subordinators; sentence embedding and expanding with clausal and phrasal modifiers)
- b. Analyze parts of speech and their distinctive structures and functions (e.g., noun phrases including count and noncount nouns and the determiner system; prepositions, adjectives, and adverbs; word transformations)
- c. Describe the forms and functions of the English verb system (e.g., modals, verb complements, and verbal phrases)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 8, Reading: 1.2)

Domain 3. Composition and Rhetoric

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations and contexts of the composition and rhetoric contained in the English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1997) as outlined in the Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999) at a post secondary level of rigor. Candidates have both broad and deep conceptual knowledge of the subject matter. Candidates face dynamic challenges in the domains of oral and written communication. They must make appropriate use of current text-production technologies and develop sensitivity to patterns of communication used by different social and cultural groups. Candidates are competent writers and speakers who are able to communicate appropriately in various rhetorical contexts, using effective text structures, word choice, sentence options, standard usage conventions, and advanced research methods as needed. The subject matter preparation program provides opportunities for candidates to develop skills and confidence in public speaking. Candidates will be able to:

3.1 Written Composing Processes (Individual and Collaborative)

- a. Reflect on and describe their own writing processes
- b. Investigate and apply alternative methods of prewriting, drafting, responding, revising, editing, and evaluating
- c. Employ such strategies as graphic organizers, outlines, notes, charts, summaries, or précis to clarify and record meaning
- d. Integrate a variety of software applications (e.g., databases, graphics, and spreadsheets) to produce print documents and multi-media presentations

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 2.1-2, 2.4, Writing: 1.4-6; Grade 7, Reading: 2.3-4, Writing: 1.3-4, 1.6-7; Grade 8, Reading: 2.4, Writing: 1.1, 1.4-1.6, Listening and Speaking: 1.4; Grades 9-10, Reading: 2.4, Writing: 1.8-9; Grades 11-12, Writing: 1.4, 1.7-9, Listening and Speaking: 2.4)

3.2 Rhetorical Features of Literary and Non-Literary, Oral and Written Texts

- a. Recognize and use a variety of writing applications (e.g., short story, biographical, autobiographical, expository, persuasive, business and technical documents, historical investigation)
- b. Demonstrate awareness of audience, purpose, and context
- c. Recognize and use various text structures (e.g., narrative and non-narrative organizational patterns)
- d. Apply a variety of methods to develop ideas within an essay (e.g., analogy, cause and effect, compare and contrast, definition, illustration, description, hypothesis)
- e. Apply critical thinking strategies to evaluate methods of persuasion, including but not limited to:
 - 1) Types of appeal (e.g., appeal to reason, emotion, morality)
 - 2) Types of persuasive speech (e.g., propositions of fact, value, problem, policy)
 - 3) Logical fallacies (e.g., bandwagon, red herring, glittering generalities, ad hominem)
 - 4) Advertising techniques (e.g., Maslow's hierarchy of needs)
 - 5) Logical argument (e.g., inductive/deductive reasoning, syllogisms, analogies)
 - 6) Classical argument (e.g., claim, qualifiers, rules of evidence, warrant)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 2.1-2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8, Writing: 1.1-3, 1.6, 2.1-5, Listening and Speaking: 1.8-9; Grade 7, Reading: 1.3, 2.2-3, Writing: 1.1-3, 1.7, 2.1-5, Listening and Speaking: 1.1, 1.3; Grade 8, Reading: 1.3, 2.2, Writing: 1.1-3, 1.5.2.1-6, Listening and Speaking: 1.8; Grades 9-10, Writing: 1.1-2, 1.4, 1.9, 2.1-6, Listening and Speaking: 1.5, 1.10, 1.13; Grades 11-12, Reading: 1.3, 2.2, 2.4-6, Writing: 1.1-5, 1.9, 2.1-6, Listening and Speaking: 1.4, 1.12-13)

3.3 Rhetorical Effects of Grammatical Elements

- a. Employ precise and extensive vocabulary and effective diction to control voice, style, and tone
- b. Use clause-joining techniques (e.g., coordinators, subordinators, and punctuation) to express logical connections between ideas
- c. Identify and use clausal and phrasal modifiers to control flow, pace, and emphasis (e.g., adjective clauses, appositives, participles and verbal phrases, absolutes)
- d. Identify and use devices to control focus in sentence and paragraph (e.g., active and passive voice, expletives, concrete subjects, and transitional phrases)
- e. Maintain coherence through use of cohesive devices

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 1.1, Writing: 1.2, 1.6, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-5; Grade 7, Writing: 1.1, 1.7, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-7; Grade 8, Writing: 1.2, 1.6, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-6, Listening and Speaking: 1.5-6; Grades 9-10, Writing: 1.1-2, 1.6, 1.9, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-5; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.1-2, Writing: 1.2-5, 1.9, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-3, Listening and Speaking: 1.5)

3.4 Conventions of Oral and Written Language

- a. Apply knowledge of linguistic structure to identify and use the conventions of Standard Edited English
- b. Recognize, understand, and use a range of conventions in both spoken and written English, including:
 - 7) Conventions of effective sentence structure (e.g., clear pronoun reference, parallel structure, appropriate verb tense)
 - 8) Preferred usage (e.g., verb/subject agreement, pronoun agreement, idioms)
 - 9) Conventions of pronunciation and intonation
 - 10) Conventional forms of spelling
 - 11) Capitalization and punctuation

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 1.1, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-5; Grade 7, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-7; Grade 8, Writing: 1.2, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-6, Listening and Speaking: 1.6; Grades 9-10, Writing: 1.9, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.9; Grades 11-12, Writing: 1.4, Written and Oral English Language Conventions: 1.1-3, Listening and Speaking: 1.8)

3.5 Research Strategies

- a. Develop and apply research questions
- b. Demonstrate methods of inquiry and investigation
- c. Identify and use multiple resources (e.g., oral, print, electronic; primary and secondary), and critically evaluate the quality of the sources
- d. Interpret and apply findings
- e. Use professional conventions and ethical standards of citation and attribution
- f. Demonstrate effective presentation methods, including multi-media formats

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 1.1, 2.1, 2.3, 2.6-8, Writing: 1.4-5, Listening and Speaking: 1.1-2, 1.6-7, 2.1, 2.3; Grade 7, Reading: 2.2, 2.6, Writing: 1.4-5, Listening and Speaking: 1.2, 1.6-7, 2.1, 2.3; Grade 8, Reading: 2.2, 2.7, Writing: 1.3-6, Listening and Speaking: 1.2-3, 1.6-8, 2.3; Grades 9-10, Reading: 2.2-5, 2.8, Writing: 1.3-8, Listening and Speaking: 1.7, 2.2; Grades 11-12, Writing: 1.4, 1.6-8, Listening and Speaking: 2.4)

Domain 4. Communications: Speech, Media, and Creative Performance

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations and contexts of the speech, media, and creative performance contained in the English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1997) as outlined in the Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999) at a post secondary level of rigor. Candidates have both broad and deep conceptual knowledge of the subject matter. The Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999) puts consistent emphasis on analysis and evaluation of oral and media communication as well as on effective public speaking and performance. The

candidate must possess the breadth of knowledge needed to integrate journalism, technological media, speech, dramatic performance, and creative writing into the language arts curriculum, including sensitivity to cultural approaches to communication. The subject matter preparation program should include opportunities for candidates to obtain knowledge and experience in these areas. The candidate skillfully applies the artistic and aesthetic tools and sensitivities required for creative expression. Candidates will be able to:

4.1 Oral Communication Processes

- a. Identify features of, and deliver oral performance in, a variety of forms (e.g., impromptu, extemporaneous, persuasive, expository, interpretive, debate)
- b. Demonstrate and evaluate individual performance skills (e.g., diction, enunciation, vocal rate, range, pitch, volume, body language, eye contact, and response to audience)
- c. Articulate principles of speaker/audience interrelationship (e.g., interpersonal communication, group dynamics, and public address)
- d. Identify and demonstrate collaborative communication skills in a variety of roles (e.g., listening supportively, facilitating, synthesizing, and stimulating higher level critical thinking through inquiry)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 1.1, Listening and Speaking: 1.1-8, 2.0; Grade 7, Listening and Speaking: 1.1-7, 2.0; Grade 8, Listening and Speaking: 1.1-8, 2.0; Grades 9-10, Listening and Speaking: 1.1, 1.3-6, 1.8-13, 2.0; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.6, Listening and Speaking: 1.4-6, 1.8-13, 2.0)

4.2 Media Analysis and Journalistic Applications

- a. Analyze the impact on society of a variety of media forms (e.g., television, advertising, radio, Internet, film)
- b. Recognize and evaluate strategies used by the media to inform, persuade, entertain, and transmit culture
- c. Identify aesthetic effects of a media presentation
- d. Demonstrate effective and creative application of these strategies and techniques to prepare presentations using a variety of media forms and visual aids

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Reading: 2.1-2, 2.6, Listening and Speaking: 1.9; Grade 7, Reading: 2.1, Listening and Speaking: 1.8-9; Grade 8, Reading: 2.1, 2.3, Listening and Speaking: 1.8-9; Grades 9-10, Reading: 2.1, Listening and Speaking: 1.1-2, 1.7, 1.9, 1.14; Grades 11-12, Reading: 2.1, Writing: 2.6, Listening and Speaking: 1.1-4, 1.9, 1.14, 2.4; Visual and Performing Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Theatre, Grades 6-12, 5.0: Connections, Relationships, Applications)

4.3 Dramatic Performance

- a. Describe and use a range of rehearsal strategies to effectively mount a production (e.g., teambuilding, scheduling, organizing resources, setting priorities, memorization techniques, improvisation, physical and vocal exercises)
- b. Employ basic elements of character analysis and approaches to acting, including physical and vocal techniques that reveal character and relationships

- c. Demonstrate basic knowledge of the language of visual composition and principles of theatrical design (e.g., set, costume, lighting, sound, and props)
- d. Apply fundamentals of stage directing, including conceptualization, blocking (movement patterns), tempo, and dramatic arc (rising and falling action)
- e. Demonstrate facility in a variety of oral performance traditions (e.g., storytelling, epic poetry, and recitation)

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6, Listening and Speaking: 2.1, 2.3; Grade 7, Listening and Speaking: 2.1; Grade 8, Listening and Speaking: 1.1, 2.1-2, 2.5; Grades 9-10, Listening and Speaking: 2.1, 2.4; Grades 11-12, Listening and Speaking: 1.7, 1.9-10, 2.5; Visual and Performing Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Theatre, Grades 6-12, 1.0: Artistic Perception, 2.0: Creative Expression, 3.0 Historical and Cultural Context, 4.0 Aesthetic Valuing)

4.4 Creative Writing

- a. Demonstrate facility in creative composition in a variety of genres (e.g., poetry, stories, plays, and film)
- b. Understand and apply processes and techniques that enhance the impact of the creative writing product (e.g., work-shopping, readings, recasting of genre, voice, and perspective)
- c. Demonstrate skill in composing creative and aesthetically compelling responses to literature

(English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Grade 6-12, Writing: 2.1)

Part 3: Implementation of Program Quality Standards for the Subject Matter Preparation of English Teachers

The 2003 Program Quality Standards for Subject Matter Preparation in English are part of a broad shift in the policies of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing related to the preparation of professional teachers and other educators in California colleges and universities resulting from the mandate of Senate Bill 2042. The Commission initiated this policy change to insure high quality in educator preparation and to combine flexibility with accountability for institutions that offer programs for prospective teachers. The success of this reform effort depends on the effective *implementation* of program quality standards for each credential.

Program Equivalency

The Ryan Act established two alternatives for prospective teachers to meet the subject matter requirement:

- individuals who completes an approved subject matter program are not required to pass the subject matter examination, and
- individuals who achieve a passing score on an adopted examination are not required to complete a subject matter program.

Subject matter programs are completed by more than half of the candidates for Single Subject Credentials.

Senate Bill 2042 required that subject matter programs and examinations be aligned with the K-12 Student Content Standards and made equivalent to each other. This has been achieved in the new standards, and references are included. A candidate who completes an approved subject matter program is issued an “equivalency” to the subject matter examination.

Review and Improvement of Subject Matter Standards

The Commission will adhere to its cycle of review and reconsideration of the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Subject Matter Programs in English* and in other subjects. The standards will be reviewed and reconsidered in relation to changes in academic disciplines, school curricula, and the backgrounds and needs of California students (K-12). Reviews of program standards will be based on the advice of subject matter teachers, professors and curriculum specialists. Prior to each review, the Commission will invite interested individuals and organizations to participate in the review process.

Adoption and Implementation of Standards by the Commission

Program sponsors have approximately two years to transition from current to new standards of quality and effectiveness for Single Subject Matter Programs. Each sponsor is being asked to select from among seven submission deadlines during the period October 2003 through March 2005. The form for requesting a submission date is included in this section. In the absence of a timely request for a submission date, the review may take longer. All program documents will be reviewed by statewide teams of peer reviewers selected from among qualified K–12 and IHE professional educators. It should be noted that each program of Single Subject Matter Preparation for the Single Subject Credentials must be submitted for review by the statewide panel. No new programs written to the old standards will be reviewed after the adoption of the new standards in January 2003.

Information about transition timelines for candidates, sunset dates for currently approved programs, and preconditions will be provided by the Commission through Coded Correspondence and additional program transition documents as it becomes available. Program sponsors should check the Commission website (www.ctc.ca.gov) frequently for updates.

Technical Assistance Meetings for Colleges and Universities

During April and May 2003, the Commission sponsored eight meetings to provide assistance to institutions related to their subject matter programs in English. The agenda for each workshop included:

- Explanation of the implementation plan adopted by the Commission.
- Description of the steps in program review and approval.
- Review of program standards, factors to consider preconditions and examples presented by Subject Matter Advisory Panel members and others with experience in implementing Standards of Program Quality.
- Opportunities to discuss subject-specific questions in small groups.

Information disseminated at those meetings is available upon request to those who were unable to attend.

Implementation Timeline: Impact on Candidates for English Credentials

Based on the Commission's implementation plan, candidates for Single Subject Credentials in English who do not plan to pass the subject matter examinations adopted by the Commission should enroll in subject matter programs that fulfill the “new” standards either (1) once a new program commences at their institution, or (2) before July 1, 2005, whichever occurs first. After a new program begins at an institution, no students should enroll for the first time in an “old” program (i.e. one approved under “old” standards). Regardless of the date when new programs are implemented, no students should enter old programs after July 1, 2005.

Candidates who enrolled in programs approved on the basis of 1994 standards (“old” programs) may complete those programs provided that (1) they entered the old programs either before new programs were available at their institutions, or before July 1, 2005, and (2) they complete the old programs before July 1, 2009. Candidates who do not comply with these timelines may qualify for Single Subject Teaching Credentials by passing the subject matter examinations that have been adopted for that purpose by the Commission.

Implementation Plan Adopted by the Commission

July 1, 2003

- (1) By July 1, 2005, existing (“old”) programs based on current guidelines should be superseded by new programs with full approval.
 - (a) Once a new program receives full approval, all students not previously enrolled in the old program (i.e., all “new” students) should enroll in the new program.
 - (b) After July 1, 2005, no “new” students should enroll in an “old” program, even if a new program in the subject is not available at that institution.
 - (c) Students who enrolled in an old program prior to July 1, 2005, may continue to complete the old program until July 1, 2009.

Timeline for Implementing the English Standards

January 2003	The Commission on Teacher Credentialing adopts the Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness that are in this handbook. The Commission adopts the implementation plan outlined in this handbook. No new subject matter programs in English will be reviewed in relation to the Commission's "old" standards.
April to May 2003	The Commission conducts statewide technical assistance meetings for developing new subject matter programs to meet the new standards.
July/October 2003	The Commission disseminates the handbook. The Commission selects, orients and trains a Program Review Panel in English. Qualified subject matter experts are prepared to review programs in relation to the standards beginning in 2003-04.
October 2003	Review and approval of programs under the new standards begins.
2003-05	Institutions may submit programs for review on or after October 1, 2003, after requesting and being assigned a submission date by Commission staff. Once a "new" program is approved, all students who were not previously enrolled in the "old" program (i.e., all new students) should enroll in the new program. Students may complete an old program if they enrolled in it either (1) prior to the commencement of the new program at their campus, or (2) prior to July 1, 2005, whichever occurs first.
July 1, 2005	"Old" programs that are based on 1994 standards must be superseded by new programs with full approval (see pages 42-43). After July 1, 2005, no new students may enroll in an old program, even if a new program in English is not yet available at the institution.
2005-09	The Commission will continue to review program proposals based on the standards and preconditions in this handbook. Institutions which submit program proposals without an assigned submission date will be reviewed at the earliest date of an opening in the submission schedule.
July 1, 2009	The final date for candidates to complete subject matter preparation programs approved under the 1994 standards. To qualify for a credential based on an "old" program, students must have entered that program prior to either (1) the implementation of a new program with full or interim approval at their institution, or (2) July 1 2005, whichever occurs first.

Implementation Timeline Diagram

January 2003

Adopt the English standards and preconditions in this handbook, including the implementation plan.

January to May, 2003

Disseminate the standards, timeline and implementation plan throughout the state. Hold regional technical assistance meetings to offer information, answer questions, and assist colleges and universities in developing new programs.

October 2003

Colleges and universities may begin to present program documents for review by the Commission's staff and Program Review Panels.

July 1, 2005

"Old" subject matter programs in English must be superseded by new approved programs.

July 1, 2009

Final date for candidates to qualify for Single Subject Credentials in English on the basis of "old" programs of subject matter preparation.

Review and Approval of English Subject Matter Programs

A regionally accredited institution of post-secondary education that would like to offer (or continue to offer) a Program of Subject Matter Preparation for the Single Subject Credential in English may present a program proposal that responds to the standards and preconditions in this handbook. The submission of programs for review and approval is voluntary for colleges and universities.

If an institution would like to offer two or more distinct programs of subject matter preparation in English, a separate proposal may be forwarded to the Commission for each program. For example, one program in English might emphasize studies of language acquisition and development, while a second program at the same institution could have an emphasis in drama or comparative literature. However, the Commission encourages institutions to coordinate its single subject programs that are within the same subject matter discipline.

The Commission is prepared to review subject matter program proposals beginning on October 1, 2003. Prior to that date, the Commission's professional staff is able to consult with institutional representatives on meeting the new standards and preparing program documents.

Selection, Composition and Training of Program Review Panels

Review panel members are selected because of their expertise in English and their knowledge of English curriculum and instruction in the public schools of California. Reviewers are selected from institutions of higher education, school districts, county offices of education, organizations of subject matter experts, and statewide professional organizations. Members are selected according to the Commission's adopted policies that govern the selection of panels. Members of the Commission's former Single Subject Waiver Panels and Subject Matter Advisory Panels may be selected to serve on Program Review Panels.

The Commission staff conducts a training and calibration session that all reviewers must attend. Training includes:

- The purpose and function of subject matter preparation programs.
- The Commission's legal responsibilities in program review and approval.
- The role of the review panel in making program determinations.
- The role of the Commission's professional staff in assisting the panel.
- A thorough analysis and discussion of each standard and rationale.
- Alternative ways in which the standard could be met.
- An overview of review panel procedures.
- Simulated practice and calibration in reviewing programs.
- Responsive feedback for program revision.

Steps in the Review of Programs

The Commission is committed to conducting a program review process that is objective, authoritative and comprehensive. The agency also seeks to be as helpful as possible to colleges and universities throughout the review process. Commission staff is available to consult with during program document development.

Review of Preconditions. An institution's response to the preconditions is reviewed by the Commission's professional staff because the preconditions are based on Commission policies and do not involve issues of program quality. Preconditions are reviewed upon the institution's formal submission of a document. Once the status of the preconditions is established, the program document is referred to the expert review panel.

Review of Program Quality Standards. Unlike the preconditions, the standards address issues of program quality and effectiveness, so each institution's response to the standards is reviewed by a small Program Review Panel of subject matter experts. If the Program Review Panel determines that a proposed program fulfills the standards, the Commission's staff recommends the program for approval by the Commission during a public meeting no more than eight weeks after the panel's decision.

If the Program Review Panel determines that the program does not meet the standards, the document is returned to the institution with an explanation of the panel's findings. Specific reasons for the panel's decision are communicated to the institution. If the panel has substantive concerns about one or more aspects of program quality, representatives of the institution can obtain information and assistance from the Commission's staff.

The Commission would like the program review process to be as helpful as possible to colleges and universities. Because a large number of institutions prepare teachers in California, representatives of an institution should first consult with the Commission's professional staff regarding programs that are in preparation or under review. The staff responds to all inquiries expeditiously and knowledgeably. Representatives of colleges and universities should contact members of a Program Review Panel only when they are authorized to do so by the Commission's staff. This restriction must be observed to ensure that membership on a panel is manageable for the reviewers. If an institution finds that needed information is not sufficiently available, please inform the designated staff consultant. If the problem is not corrected in a timely way, please contact the executive director of the Commission. After changes have been made in the program, the proposal may be re-submitted to the Commission's staff for reconsideration by the panel.

If the Program Review Panel determines that minor or technical changes should be made in a program, the responsibility for reviewing the resubmitted document rests with the Commission's professional staff, which presents the *revised* program to the Commission for approval without further review by the panel.

Appeal of an Adverse Decision. An institution that would like to appeal a decision of the staff (regarding preconditions) or the Program Review Panel (regarding standards) may do so by submitting the appeal to the executive director of the Commission. The institution should include the following information in the appeal:

- The original program document and the stated reasons of the Commission's staff or the review panel for not recommending approval of the program.
- A specific response by the institution to the initial denial, including a copy of the resubmitted document (if it has been resubmitted).

- A rationale for the appeal by the institution.

The CCTC executive director may deny the appeal, or appoint an independent review panel, or present the appeal directly to the Commission for consideration.

Submission Guidelines for Single Subject Matter Program Documents

To facilitate the proposal review and approval process, Commission staff has developed the following instructions for organizations submitting documents for approval of Single Subject Matter Programs. It is essential that these instructions be followed accurately. Failure to comply with these procedures can result in a proposal being returned to the prospective program sponsor for reformatting and/or revision prior to being forwarded to program reviewers.

Transmittal Instructions

Sponsoring agencies are required to submit **three printed and bound notebook copies** of their proposal(s), **and one unbound copy** to the following address:

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Professional Services Division: Single Subject Matter Programs
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814

In addition, **one electronic CD ROM copy of the proposal text** (including supporting evidence where possible) should be submitted. This electronic submission should be in Microsoft Word, or a Microsoft Word compatible format. Some phases of the review process will involve secure web-based editing. To facilitate this process, please leave no spaces in the name of your document, and be sure that the name of the file ends in ".doc" (example: CCTCdocument.doc).

Submittal Deadlines

There are seven opportunities during which to submit proposals for review and approval. The submittal deadlines are:

October 1, 2003	August 2, 2004
January 5, 2004	November 2, 2004
March 2, 2004	March 1, 2005*
June 1, 2004	

*Any programs submitted after 2005 will be reviewed according to the availability of the review panel.

Transmittal Documents

Additional materials including the required Transmittal Cover Sheet are included at the end of this section. Sponsoring agencies should send the Sponsoring Organization Transmittal Cover Sheet with the original signatures of the program contacts and chief executive officer along with their proposal(s). In addition, each of the four copies of each proposal should begin with a copy of the Sponsoring Organization Transmittal Cover Sheet. The program contact identified on the Transmittal Cover Sheet, which is included at the end of this document, will be informed electronically and by mail as changes occur. Program sponsors are strongly urged to consult the CCTC web site at www.ctc.ca.gov for updates relating to the implementation of new single subject matter standards.

Each proposal must be organized in the following order:

- Transmittal Cover Sheet
- Table of Contents
- Responses to Each Standard, including the Common Standards.

The response to the standards must:

- be tabbed/labeled to help guide the reviewers,
- have numbered pages,
- include a matrix identifying which courses meet which standards to address the pre-conditions, and
- provide supporting evidence included after each response or organized into appendices. Evidence should be cross-referenced in the response, and appendices *must* be tabbed for easy access by reviewers.

Blended Programs

Blended Program sponsors are reminded that they must have an approved Subject Matter Preparation Program for the Single Subject Preliminary Credential and an approved Professional Teacher Preparation Program for the Single Subject Preliminary Credential in order to apply for approval for a Blended Program. The transition timeline for blended programs is the same as for single subject programs; all submissions must adhere to the 7/1/03-7/1/05 timeframe to avoid interruption in approved program admissions. Program sponsors may submit a Blended Program proposal at the same time as a single subject matter program submissions. A submission request form is included with the single subject submission form at the end of this section.

Responding to Standards

The Commission adopted 10 standards that relate to program design and structure for programs in *all* single subject disciplines.

Standard 1	Program Philosophy and Purpose
Standard 2	Diversity and Equity
Standard 3	Technology
Standard 4	Literacy
Standard 5	Varied Teaching Strategies
Standard 6	Early Field Experiences
Standard 7	Assessment of Subject Matter Competence
Standard 8	Advisement and Support
Standard 9	Program Review and Evaluation
Standard 10	Coordination

These 10 standards are referred to as “standards common to all” because they are the same in all subject areas.

An institution’s program document should include a subject-specific reply to Standards 1 through 10. However, an institution *may* submit a “generic response” to these ten common standards. In a “generic response,” the institution should describe how credential preparation programs in all subjects will meet the four standards. A “generic response” should include sufficient information to enable an interdisciplinary panel of reviewers to determine that the ten common standards are met for each subject area for which approval is requested.

The Standards Common to All suggest certain institutional mechanisms that could be common to all subject matter programs. For instance, institutional support for academic programs in the standards for technology or diversity and equity could apply to all subject matter programs. However, both of these standards (and many others) also require some measure of subject-specific program information. Once the institution’s generic response is approved, it would not be necessary to respond to the ten standards in the institution’s program document in any subject which has already been addressed and approved in the generic document.

Program proposals should provide sufficient information about how the program intends to deliver content consistent with each standard so that a knowledgeable team of professionals can determine whether each standard has been met by the program. The goal in writing the response to any standard should be to describe the proposed program clearly enough for an outside reader to understand what a prospective teacher will experience, as he or she progresses through the program in terms of depth, breadth, and sequencing of instructional and field experiences, and what he or she will know and be able to do and demonstrate at the end of the program. Review teams will then be able to assess the responses for consistency with the standard, completeness of the response, and quality of the supporting evidence.

The written text should be organized in the same format as the standard itself and the required elements. **Responses that do not address each standard and all of its required elements will be considered incomplete.** Responses should not merely reiterate the standard. They should

demonstrate how the standard will be met by describing both the content and processes that will be used to implement the program and by providing evidence to support the explanation.

Lines of suitable evidence will vary with each standard. Some examples of evidence helpful for review teams include:

- Charts and graphic organizers to illustrate program organization and design
- Descriptions of faculty qualifications, including vitae for full time faculty
- Course or module outlines or showing the sequence of course topics, classroom activities, materials and texts used, and out-of-class assignments
- Specific descriptions of assignments and other formative assessments that demonstrate how prospective teachers will reinforce and extend key concepts and/or demonstrate an ability or competence
- Documentation of materials to be used, including tables of contents of textbooks and identification of assignments from the texts, and citations for other reading assignments.
- Current catalog descriptions.

Packaging A Submission for Shipment to the Commission

Please do **not**:

- Use foam peanuts as packaging material
- Overstuff the binders. Use two binders if necessary.
- Overstuff the boxes in which the binders are packed, as these may break open in shipment.

Submission Request Form

For Single Subject Matter Preparation Program Response to Standards

Program Sponsor (Name of Institution and Department)

Please fill out the requested information below to help us plan for providing technical assistance in a timely manner.

Contact Person: _____ **Title:** _____

Department: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ **Fax:** _____

Email: _____

Please indicate the subject area for which you are submitting a program proposal document:

English _____ Mathematics _____ Science _____ Social Science _____

Please indicate when you intend to submit program documents responding to the new Single Subject Matter Preparation Standards: Rank your first four choices from the time frames provided below (1 = first choice, 4 = last choice):

Submission responding to the Single Subject Matter Preparation Standards by:

____ October 3, 2003 ____ August 2, 2004

____ January 5, 2004 ____ November 2, 2004

____ March 2, 2004 ____ March 1, 2005

____ June 1, 2004

Submit to: Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Professional Services Division:
Single Subject Matter Programs
1900 Capitol Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax (916) 324-8927

THIS FORM HAS TWO PAGES

Submission Request Form
Blended Teacher Preparation Program Response to Standards

Program Sponsor (Name of Institution and Department)

Please fill out the requested information below to help us plan for providing technical assistance in a timely manner.

Contact Person: _____ **Title:** _____

Department: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ **Fax:** _____

Email: _____

If you are presently operating any CLAD Emphasis program(s) as part of your Blended Program(s), please indicate the type of response you will be submitting:

_____ SB 2042 only (includes AB 1059 authorization)

_____ SB 2042 "Plus" (includes AB 1059 authorization plus CLAD Certificate)

Please indicate when you intend to submit program documents responding to the new Blended Program Standards: Rank your first four choices from the time frames provided below (1 = first choice, 4 = last choice):

_____ October 3, 2003

_____ August 2, 2004

_____ January 5, 2004

_____ November 2, 2004

_____ March 2, 2004

_____ March 1, 2005

_____ June 1, 2004

Submit to: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Professional Services Division: Blended Programs
1900 Capitol Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax (916) 327-3165

Single Subject Matter Program Sponsor - Transmittal Cover Sheet
(Page 1 of 2)

- **Sponsoring Organization:**

Name _____

- **Submission Type(s) Place a check mark in the appropriate box.**

English Subject Matter Preparation	
Mathematics Subject Matter Preparation	
Science Subject Matter Preparation	
Social Science Subject Matter Preparation	

- **Program Contacts:**

1. Name _____

Title _____

Address _____

Phone _____ Fax _____

E-mail _____

Single Subject Program Sponsor - Transmittal Cover Sheet
(Page 2 of 2)

Name _____

Title _____

Address _____

Phone _____ Fax _____

E-mail _____

Chief Executive Officer (*President or Provost; Superintendent*):

Name _____

Address _____

Phone _____ Fax _____

E-mail _____

**I Hereby Signify My Approval to Transmit This Program Document to the
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing:**

CEO Signature _____

Title _____

Date _____

Appendix A

(For English Teacher Preparation in California)

Assembly Bill No. 537

(Education Code Chapter 587, Statutes of 1999)

CHAPTER 587

An act to amend Sections 200, 220, 66251, and 66270 of, to add Section 241 to, and to amend and renumber Sections 221 and 66271 of, the Education Code, relating to discrimination.

[Approved by Governor October 2, 1999. Filed with Secretary of State October 10, 1999.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 537, Kuehl. Discrimination.

(1) Existing law provides that it is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons in public schools and postsecondary institutions, regardless of their sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, or mental or physical disability, equal rights and opportunities in the educational institutions of the state.

Existing law makes it a crime for a person, whether or not acting under color of law, to willfully injure, intimidate, interfere with, oppress, or threaten any other person, by force or threat of force, in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him or her by the Constitution or laws of this state or by the Constitution or laws of the United States because of the other person’s race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, gender, or sexual orientation, or because he or she perceives that the other person has one or more of those characteristics.

This bill would also provide that it is the policy of the state to afford all persons in public school and postsecondary institutions equal rights and opportunities in the educational institutions of the state, regardless of any basis referred to in the aforementioned paragraph.

(2) Existing law prohibits a person from being subjected to discrimination on the basis of sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, color, or mental or physical disability in any program or activity conducted by any educational institution or postsecondary educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls students who receive state student financial aid.

This bill would also prohibit a person from being subjected to discrimination on the basis of any basis referred to in paragraph (1) in any program or activity conducted by any educational institution or postsecondary educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls students who receive state student financial aid.

(3) This bill would state that it does not require the inclusion of any curriculum, textbook, presentation, or other material in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution or a postsecondary educational institution and would prohibit this bill from being deemed to be

violated by the omission of any curriculum, textbook, presentation, or other material in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution or a postsecondary educational institution.

To the extent that this bill would impose new duties on school districts and community college districts, it would impose a state-mandated local program.

(4) The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement, including the creation of a State Mandates Claims Fund to pay the costs of mandates that do not exceed \$1,000,000 statewide and other procedures for claims whose statewide costs exceed \$1,000,000.

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. This bill shall be known, and may be cited, as the California Student Safety and Violence Prevention Act of 2000.

SEC. 2. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(1) Under the California Constitution, all students of public schools have the inalienable right to attend campuses that are safe, secure, and peaceful. Violence is the number one cause of death for young people in California and has become a public health problem of epidemic proportion. One of the Legislature's highest priorities must be to prevent our children from the plague of violence.

(2) The fastest growing, violent crime in California is hate crime, and it is incumbent upon us to ensure that all students attending public school in California are protected from potentially violent discrimination. Educators see how violence affects youth every day; they know first hand that youth cannot learn if they are concerned about their safety. This legislation is designed to protect the institution of learning as well as our students.

(3) Not only do we need to address the issue of school violence but also we must strive to reverse the increase in teen suicide. The number of teens who attempt suicide, as well as the number who actually kill themselves, has risen substantially in recent years. Teen suicides in the United States have doubled in number since 1960 and every year over a quarter of a million adolescents in the United States attempt suicide. Sadly, approximately 4,000 of these attempts every year are completed. Suicide is the third leading cause of death for youths 15 through 24 years of age. To combat this problem we must seriously examine these grim statistics and take immediate action to ensure all students are offered equal protection from discrimination under California law.

SEC. 3. Section 200 of the Education Code is amended to read:

200. It is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons in public schools, regardless of their sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, mental or physical disability, or regardless of any basis that is contained in the prohibition of hate crimes set forth in subdivision (a) of Section 422.6 of the Penal Code, equal rights and opportunities in the educational institutions of the state. The purpose of this chapter is to prohibit acts which are contrary to that policy and to provide remedies therefor.

SEC. 4. Section 220 of the Education Code is amended to read:

220. No person shall be subjected to discrimination on the basis of sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, color, mental or physical disability, or any basis that

is contained in the prohibition of hate crimes set forth in subdivision (a) of Section 422.6 of the Penal Code in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls pupils who receive state student financial aid.

SEC. 5. Section 221 of the Education Code is renumbered to read:

220.5. This article shall not apply to an educational institution which is controlled by a religious organization if the application would not be consistent with the religious tenets of that organization.

SEC. 6. Section 241 is added to the Education Code, to read:

241. Nothing in the California Student Safety and Violence Prevention Act of 2000 requires the inclusion of any curriculum, textbook, presentation, or other material in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution or postsecondary educational institution; the California Student Safety and Violence Prevention Act of 2000 shall not be deemed to be violated by the omission of any curriculum, textbook, presentation, or other material in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution or postsecondary educational institution.

SEC. 7. Section 66251 of the Education Code is amended to read:

66251. It is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons, regardless of their sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, mental or physical disability, or regardless of any basis that is contained in the prohibition of hate crimes set forth in subdivision (a) of Section 422.6 of the Penal Code, equal rights and opportunities in the postsecondary institutions of the state. The purpose of this chapter is to prohibit acts that are contrary to that policy and to provide remedies therefor.

SEC. 8. Section 66270 of the Education Code is amended to read:

66270. No person shall be subjected to discrimination on the basis of sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, color, or mental or physical disability, or any basis that is contained in the prohibition of hate crimes set forth in subdivision (a) of Section 422.6 of the Penal Code in any program or activity conducted by any postsecondary educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls students who receive state student financial aid.

SEC. 9. Section 66271 of the Education Code is renumbered to read:

66270.5. This chapter shall not apply to an educational institution that is controlled by a religious organization if the application would not be consistent with the religious tenets of that organization.

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding Section 17610 of the Government Code, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code. If the statewide cost of the claim for reimbursement does not exceed one million dollars (\$1,000,000), reimbursement shall be made from the State Mandates Claims Fund.

APPENDIX E

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing STANDARDS OF QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS FOR PROGRAMS IN ENGLISH

Team Worksheet

The purpose of this document review is to determine whether the teacher preparation program identified below meets the Commission's Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Single Subject Matter Preparation Programs. Program quality must be clearly and effectively substantiated for the standard as a whole as well as for each of the required elements within the standard. The standard cannot be deemed to have been met without evidence that each of the required elements has been adequately addressed. Based on the evidence provided by the program sponsor, you are asked to assess the extent to which you found the:

Standard Met - All of the elements of the standard are present and effectively implemented (or a clear plan is in place to address all of the required elements, as appropriate to the institution's degree of readiness for implementation).

Standard Response Needs More Information - On balance, based on the evidence provided by the program sponsor, the institution or program needs to provide additional information regarding one or more elements of the standard or the standard as a whole.

Program Reviewed CSU Long Beach

Reviewer's Name Panel 526

Date 10/20/04

Edit Reviewer Info

Additional Dates: resubmission 1/05

Recommendation: (Commission Staff Use Only)

Submit for Approval.

Submit for Approval, if technical revisions are made.

Return for substantial changes.

Edit Recommendation

Preconditions: (Commission Staff Use Only)

Meets the

Precondition

Needs More Information

1.

2.

3.

Edit Preconditions

Edit Preconditions

Comments:

Though the course list provided is extensive, it cannot be determined which courses are required and which are elective. Please identify the program course requirements clearly.

(10/18/04)

Preconditions met. (1/19/05)

[Add a comment](#)

A. Standards Common to All Programs

Standard 1:

Program Philosophy and

Purpose

[Review this Standard](#)

1.1 ☐

1.2 ☐

1.3 ☐

1.4 ☐

1.5 ☐

1.6 ☐

Comments: [Add a comment](#)

Standard 2:

Diversity and Equity

[Review this Standard](#)

2.1 ☐

2.2 ☐

2.3 ☐

2.4 ☐

2.5 ☐

Comments: [Add a comment](#)

Standard 3:

Technology

[Review this Standard](#)

3.1 ☐

3.2 ☐

3.3 ☐

Comments: 3.1 Please provide a syllabus for University 100 and show how it is connected to English subject matter.
(10/18/04)

Standard met. (1/19/05)

[Add a comment](#)

Standard 4:

Literacy

[Review this Standard](#)

4.1 ☐

4.2 ☐

4.3 ☐

Comments: [Add a comment](#)

Standard 5:

Varied Teaching Strategies

[Review this Standard](#)

5.1 ☐

5.2 ☐

5.3 ☐

5.4 ☐

5.5 ☐

Comments: [Add a comment](#)

Standard 6:

Early Field Experiences

[Review this Standard](#)

6.1 []

6.2 []

6.3 []

6.4 []

6.5 []

Comments: [Add a comment](#)

Standard 7:

Assessment of Subject Matter

Competence

[Review this Standard](#)

7.1 []

7.2 []

7.3 []

7.4 []

7.5 []

7.6 []

Comments: 7.5 Please provide faculty vitae or the hiring criteria for English faculty.

(10/18/04)

Standard met. (1/19/05)

[Add a comment](#)

Standard 8:

Advisement and Support

[Review this Standard](#)

8.1 []

8.2 []

8.3 []

8.4 []

Comments: [Add a comment](#)

Standard 9:

Program Review and

Evaluation

[Review this Standard](#)

9.1 []

9.2 []

9.3 []

9.4 []

Comments: [Add a comment](#)

Standard 10:

Coordination

[Review this Standard](#)

10.1 []

10.2 []

10.3 []

10.4 []

10.5 []

Comments: [Add a comment](#)

B. Standards For English**Standard 11:**

Required Subjects of Study

Review this Standard

11.1 []

11.2 []

11.3 []

11.4 []

11.5 []

11.6 []

Comments: How does every student receive instruction in the whole span of eras of both American and British Literature?

11.4 Please provide evidence that students choosing only one required course from the world literature selections will receive a balanced exposure to world literature. (10/18/04)

Standard met. (1/19/05)

Add a comment

Standard 12:

Extended Studies

Review this Standard

12.1 []

12.2 []

12.3 []

Comments: Add a comment

Standard 13:

Literature and Textual

Analysis

Review this Standard

13.1 []

13.2 []

13.3 []

13.4 []

13.5 []

Comments: How does every student receive instruction in the whole span of eras of both American and British Literature?

13.1 Please provide evidence that students choosing only one required course from the world literature selections will receive a balanced exposure to world literature. (10/18/04)

Standard met. (1/19/05)

Add a comment

Standard 14:

Language, Linguistics and

Literacy

Review this Standard

14.1 []

14.2 []

14.3 []

14.4 []

14.5 []

Comments: Please provide a Table of Contents of

core text used in ENGL 339 for
verification of coverage of all SMR's in
Linguistics. (10/18/04)
Standard met. (1/19/05)
[Add a comment](#)

Standard 15:

Composition and Rhetoric
[Review this Standard](#)

15.1 []

15.2 []

15.3 []

15.4 []

15.5 []

Comments: [Add a comment](#)

Standard 16:

Communications: Speech,
Media and Creative
Performance
[Review this Standard](#)

16.1 []

16.2 []

16.3 []

16.4 []

16.5 []

16.6 []

16.7 []

Comments: 16.3 Please provide more specific
evidence of courses in the core which
require media analysis, including syllabus
for Sheley which cannot be found. Course
384 is not in the core, and a reference to
media in 410 cannot be found. Syllabi for
337 and 482 do not specifically integrate
media analysis.

16.7 Please provide evidence that all
students produce creative writing in core
courses. Syllabi show some students
taking a particular instructor for 375 and
482 have the opportunity to choose to
produce a piece of creative writing.
(10/18/04)

Standard met. (1/19/05)

[Add a comment](#)

[Control Panel](#)

This page is powered by the Sparrow system for group editable web pages. The
template from

which this page was derived is

Copyright (c) 2000-2001 Xerox CORPORATION. All Rights reserved.